



The Catholic Historical Review

VOLUME VI

JULY, 1920

NUMBER 2

FRANCISCAN EXPLORATION OF CALIFORNIA

INTRODUCTORY

Never-ending interest attaches to the temporal and spiritual conquest of California by the eighteenth century Spaniards whose sword and cross gave the Pacific coastline into the power of Church and State. The story has been told and re-told by writers whose number and points of view are almost legion. There yet remains to be told, in a single consecutive narrative, the story of the part played by the missionaries of the Order of St. Francis in the pioneer work of exploration which made known the lands that were held and the peoples that were brought under the banner of the Church. Always efficient coadjutors, and in many cases initiators, of the work undertaken, the members of this Order have made for themselves a large place in the history of California in particular, and of the Pacific Coast in general.

The limitations set for this paper are in a degree artificial. To confine attention to the exploration of a single state would be perhaps in no other case save that of Texas, as feasible anywhere else as in that of California. The lands sought by the Franciscan explorers within our present confines are a geographical unit. To the east of California, exploration concerned an area still distinct in many essentials. The great land of New Mexico had a separate history and administration, and was never closely assimilated with California under either Spain or Mexico. To the west, the great coastal sea-voyages, reaching far beyond the northern boundaries of the United States, were directed chiefly toward adding to the Spanish crown a territory which was never "California" after the occupation of San Diego and Monterey, was held only for a very brief span of years, and was not so distinctively the field of Franciscan interest as was the coast

as far as San Francisco. The present narrative is, therefore, limited to the briefest possible account of the background of history which made possible the occupation of California in 1769, with a more ample relation of the actual explorations which resulted in the establishment of the notable chain of missions, from their inception down to the final unsuccessful attempts to spread from the coast into the interior during the first quarter of the nineteenth century. A continuous story of this exploration has never been told, and its later phases have had especially scant attention. This narrative will, perhaps then, render a service to charity and continuity, and will make evident the durable side-products of Franciscan evangelical activities, especially their contribution to early geographical knowledge of the State, its nomenclature and ethnology.

THE FIRST STEPS

The progress of the Spaniards to the "famous port of San Francisco" was from Mexico City as a base, and was made by slow and painful stages through a period of nearly two hundred and fifty years from the time when Cortés razed the city of Tenochtitlán. He advanced the colors of Spain along the western coast from Zacatula (founded 1522) to Colima. Nuño de Guzmán swept northwestward, between 1529 and 1531, into Sinaloa with a large force, adding a great territory which, though never occupied in absolute peace for many years at a time, nevertheless remained in the power of the king. In 1536, the romantic story of Cabeza de Vaca, confirmed by the Franciscan Niza, brought about the stupendous undertaking of Coronado in 1540 by which New Mexico was reached by way of Sonora. Cooperating with Coronado was Alarcón, who ascended the Gulf of California to the mouth of the Colorado River, and Melchior Díaz, who, marching through Sonora, reached that stream over the path later trod by Father Kino, the Jesuit, and Fray Francisco Garcés, the Franciscan. Spanish continental exploration into the northwest had thus early met the great life barrier of the Colorado Desert, but for the interposition of which progress into California would have been as easy and as rapid as the extension of the king's domain throughout the present cornucopia-shaped land of Mexico.

To recount how the steps of this advance to the Primería

were made by the patient toil of religious and miner and settler would be tedious, sketched in barest outline. Over the northern lands, whither mines and grazing lands enticed the secular Spaniards in growingly significant numbers, the shadow of the Cross was carried by the labors of Franciscans, Jesuits, and Dominicans. The Kingdom of Nueva Galicia, created by 1531 and embracing the early conquests of Cortés, Guzmán, and their successors, was gathered spiritually under the mitre of the bishop of Michoacán as early as 1537. A new bishopric and audiencia were formed in this kingdom in 1544 and 1548 respectively. Outside the pale of reduced Christendom lay the present territory of Sinaloa, which was entered by Jesuit missionaries in 1591, and reduced in the main by 1678. This Order extended its labors into Sonora during the seventeenth century along the Sonora River valley, thence pushing into Pimería Alta proper, between the Altar and Gila rivers, in 1687. In the northernmost of these missions was Father Francisco Eusebio Kino, at Dolores, on an upper branch of the Sonora. In 1700, he founded San Xavier del Bac, across the divide, in the Santa Cruz River valley of Arizona. This affluent of the Gila River afforded an easier avenue of progress northward than the desert lands to the west. Exploration from this point by the Jesuits, though notable, bore no actual fruit in temporal conquests until after the Franciscans had taken over the field in 1769.

LOWER CALIFORNIA AND THE EARLY COAST VOYAGES

Meantime, knowledge of the Pacific Coast had been growing. The early voyages under the auspices of Cortés, by Hurtado de Mendoza to 27° by his reckoning, that of his second ship as far as Culiacán, by Diego Becerro and Fortún Ximénez to the tip of Lower California, by Cortés himself over much the same waters as his lieutenants, and by Francisco de Ulloa to 30°, had given a general knowledge of the Gulf of California and the coasts of the peninsula, as had the Alarcón voyage already referred to.

Following on the heels of these pioneers came the Cabrillo-Ferrelo discoveries in 1542, of the coast beyond the fortieth parallel, leaving at least a tradition which was to be rendered more certain by the voyages of Sebastian Vizcaíno in 1600 and

1602. His explorations bore fruit in a chart of the coast which was for a long time outside the knowledge of writers on the Pacific voyages.¹ The Vizcaíno voyages gave to the coast the names San Diego (Cabrillo's San Miguel), Monterey, San Francisco, and a number of names of headlands, which were recorded in the *Navigación especulativa* of Cabrera Bueno, and preserved thus to the interest of the eighteenth century conquerors. Iterated insistently in their plans for the actual occupation of the early discoveries when impetus thereto had been given from without by the proximate arrival of foreign competitors, these names were practically all that remained as common knowledge concerning California. They served, however, to beckon the desire of the statesmen who desired the northern lands.

The leaders possessed knowledge, no doubt, of the difficult terrain to be crossed between Sonora and California; they assuredly had information concerning the explorations of Father Garcés in the basin of the Colorado; hence it is not strange that Lower California instead of Sonora was used as a base for the first land expeditions to Vizcaíno's San Diego and Monterey. It was nearer by many leagues, and had the advantage of no great rivers to cross, with no Apaches to hang on the flanks of the marchers.

Since the days of Cortés, the peninsula had been the objective of numerous pearl-fishing enterprises from across the Gulf. The exploiters included Casanate, Atondo, Iturbe, Cardona, and Ortega. The latter made a third attempt at permanent settlement, but Lower California became the field of Jesuit missionary work in 1697 only, following interest inspired by Kino in Salvatierra, Ugarte, and their companions from the mainland missions. During the brief Jesuit tenure, until 1767, there were founded some nineteen missions extending northward to Santa María, which was one of the fifteen existing missions taken over by the Franciscans upon the Jesuit expulsion in the year just mentioned. These establishments were made the base for the first expedition to the north. They were so used only temporarily, because they were practically denuded for the first effort, and

¹ The chart was faithfully reproduced by Enrico Martínez, cosmographer of the expedition, for the archives in Spain. Facsimile reproductions of the Martínez sketches are in the Bancroft Library.

movement therefrom depended upon the perilous Gulf voyage from the Sonora coast.

THE PENINSULA AS A POINT OF DEPARTURE

In the year following the installation of the Fernandine Franciscans in the missions of the peninsula, the somnolent interest of Spain was aroused in the permanent occupation of the northern coast to forestall Russian advances southward from the fur-trading posts which had been established following the discoveries by Behring and Tcherikov between 1741 and 1765. This interest resulted in the occupation of San Diego and Monterey by the Gálvez expeditions of 1769.

For this purpose two land and two sea expeditions were sent. The first sea expedition left San Blas on the west Mexican coast in the *San Carlos* on January 19, 1769, under command of Vicente Vila. The vessel bore also Miguel Costansó as cosmographer, Fray Hernando Parrón, and Pedro Fages, lieutenant of Catalonian volunteers. She entered the port of San Diego on April 29, having added nothing to knowledge of the coast. The second sea expedition left San Lucas, Lower California, on February 15, in the *San Antonio*, under Juan Pérez, and reached San Diego April 11. On this vessel went Fathers Juan Vizcáino and Francisco Gómez. She had made a landing on and had named Santa Cruz Island, but had added no other knowledge of the new coast.

The two land expeditions went up the peninsula. The first, under Captain Fernando Rivera y Moncada, left San Fernando Velicatá on March 24, numbering among its members Father Juan Crespi and José Cañizares. It arrived at San Diego May 14, having traveled one hundred and twenty-one leagues.²

The second land expedition, under Gaspar de Portolá, following the track of Rivera on May 15, reached San Diego in small detachments, the last of which arrived on July 1, Father Junípero Serra among its members. Almost six months had been consumed in transporting four groups of men a distance of not over four hundred and fifty miles. Of the original expeditionaries many had died of scurvy and exposure, and many more were to succumb. An entire year had elapsed since the beginning of

² CRESPI, FR. JUAN, *Primera expedicion de tierra al descubrimiento del puerto de San Diego*, in PALÓU, *Noticias de la Nueva California* (1874), Vol. ii, pp. 93-149.

preparations in Lower California, and more than two since the inception of the project by Gálvez and Croix in Mexico City.

THE FIRST JOURNEY TO MONTEREY

At San Diego it was found that lack of sailors from losses impeded further sea progress. The *San Antonio* was therefore sent back for new supplies and men, while about forty persons, including the physically unfit, some soldiers, and Father Serra, remained at San Diego and founded the mission there on July 16, at a spot called by the natives Cosoy, later called Old Town. On July 14, Portolá set out upon his search for Monterey, one hundred and fifty-nine leagues distant, where he was to found a presidio and mission to be called San Carlos.³

³ CRESPI, FR. JUAN, *Viage de la expedicion de tierra a Monterey*. In PALÓU, *Noticias de la Nueva California*, Vol. ii, pp. 100-208.

PORTOLÁ, GASPER, *Diario del viage que haze por tierra Don Gaspar de Portolá, capitan de dragones del Regimiento de España, Gobernador de Californias, á los puertos de San Francisco y Monterey* . . . MS., 1770. Printed with translation by the Academy of Pacific Coast History in its *Publications*, Vol. i, No. 3, Berkeley, 1909.

COSTANSÓ, MIGUEL, *Diario historico de los viages de mar y tierra, hechos al norte de la California de orden del Excelentísimo Señor Marqués de Croix, virrey, gobernador, y capitan general de la Nueva España* . . . Mexico, 1770. An English translation by William Reveley with the title, *An historical journal of the expeditions by sea and land to the north of California* . . . appeared in London, 1790. Both Spanish and English versions were printed by the Academy of Pacific Coast History in its *Publications*, Vol. i, No. 4, 1910.

COSTANSÓ, MIGUEL, *Diario del viage de tierra hecho al norte de la California* . . . 1770. Printed with translation by the Academy of Pacific Coast History in its *Publications*, Vol. 2, No. 4, 1911.

Estracto de noticias del puerto de Monterrey, de la mission y presidio que se han establecido en el con la denominacion de San Carlos, y del suceso de las dos expediciones de mar y tierra que a este fin se despacharon en el año proximo anterior de 1769. Mexico, 1770. Two editions published with same place and date. Reprinted in PALÓU, *Relacion historica de la rida* . . . del Venerable Padre . . . Serra (1787), pp. 108-12, and with translation in the Academy of Pacific Coast History *Publications*, Vol. 1, No. 2, 1909.

FAGES, PEDRO, *Continuacion y suplemento a los dos impresos que de orden de este superior gobierno han corrido: el uno con el titulo de "Extracto de noticias del puerto de Monterrey," su fecha 16 de Agosto de 1770; y el otro titulado "Diario histórico de los viajes de mar y tierra hechos al norte de California," su fecha 24 Octubre del mismo año. Hase y presenta esta relacion por superior mandato de su Excelencia el Señor Virrey actual de estos reynos, Don Antonio María Bucareli y Ursúa, el capitan de infantería de la Compañía Franca de Voluntarios de Cataluña, y comandante militar que ha sido de los nuevos establecimientos en aquellas provincias, Don Pedro Fages*. Mexico, November 20, 1775. Mexico, Museo Nacional, *Documentos relativos á las misiones de Californias*, folio series, Vol. 4. Listed in BOLTON, *Guide*, p. 201.

Portolá's party traversed the route later designated the Camino Real or main highway. The journey was made practically by following the course of the coast northward.⁴ The first point of interest was that christened San Juan Capistrano, the future site of San Luis Rey Mission. On July 28, the explorers crossed the Santa Ana River, naming it Jesús de los Temblores to commemorate earthquakes there experienced. The San Gabriel Valley they named San Miguel; through it they passed northwest to the Los Angeles River, on which they camped near the site of the modern city on the day of the Grand Pardon of Assisi. Going then through the pass into San Fernando Valley, they traversed it in five days until, passing through the Santa Susana Mountains, perhaps by way of Tapo Pass, they reached and named the Santa Clara River. This stream they marched down for five days to a place they named Asunción, later the location of San Buenaventura Mission.⁵

On August 18, the party was at Laguna de la Concepción, where Santa Barbara Mission was later founded. Passing along the Channel, the Spaniards were struck by the culture of the Indians there, and wrote into their diaries some of the most valuable accounts extant of those vanished peoples. A name which Portolá gave to an island in a lagoon some ten miles west of Santa Barbara, Mescaltitan, still survives.

On August 28, a camp above Point Concepción was named Los Pedernales, from the flints there picked up. Crossing the Santa Inez River dry-shod over a sand-bank at its mouth, they reached Point Sal, turned inland to avoid the sand-dunes of the beach, and reached Oso Flaco, the name of which yet preserves the memory of their meeting here a lean bear. Passing through the village of a chief who had a huge tumor on his neck, the soldiers named it the *Ranchería del Buchón* from that circumstance. The name still lingers to designate several local points.

Printed in *Nouvelles Annales des Voyages*, Vol. ci, pp. 143-82, 311-47 (1844), as *Voyage en Californie*.

⁴ H. H. BANCROFT, *History of California*, Vol. i, pp. 142-6, prints a list of places mentioned in Crespi's *Diary*, with distances, bearings, and latitudes. There are also notes from the return trip from FAGES' *Continuacion*, and comments by BANCROFT. See Z. S. ELDRIDGE, *The march of Portolá and the log of the San Carlos*, 1909.

⁵ The diaries of the first expedition are for the most part silent as to native place-names, a feature in which they contrast to a degree with the diaries of the nineteenth century explorations.

Now going up San Luis Creek and camping on the present site of San Luis Obispo, they went on into the canyon still called the Cañada de los Osos, in which the soldiers had one of their first experiences fighting California bears on horseback. The difficulties of canyon traveling were now exchanged for those of swampy lands about Morro Bay, and again, the way was cut off by the Santa Lucía Mountains, in which the Spaniards wandered, seventeen of them sick with scurvy, until they emerged by way of the Arroyo Seco near Paso Robles on September 26. They named the glen the Cañada del Palo Caído because they found here Indians living in the open air under a fallen tree. They camped at a river which many thought was the famed Carmelo. It has borne in turn the names San Elizario, Santa Delfina, Rio de Monterey, and Salinas, by the last of which it is now known.

It proved their best course to the sea, near which, from the sound, they knew themselves to be on September 30, and felt sure they had passed the Sierra de Santa Lucía and must be near the longed-for port of Monterey. Exploration for it was now in order. Portolá sent Rivera south to search, while he, Crespi, and Costansó from a hill saw Año Nuevo and Pinos points, which from their landfalls should have inclosed Monterey Bay, but the waters there seen did not answer the description. Perplexed, the leaders decided to go on, after some farther exploration. On October 8, they crossed the Pájaro River, and on the seventeenth, the San Lorenzo, near the present site of Santa Cruz. On the twentieth, they had reached Point Año Nuevo, where they rested two days, Portolá and Rivera now being among the sick.

Passing northwestward, the explorers camped on Gazos Creek; then, passing Point Año Nuevo, they crossed San Gregorio and Purísima creeks, coming to the Ranchería de las Pulgas, where the fleas in some deserted huts caused such diversion that the name has clung to a well-known land grant in the region. On October 28, the party was at Halfmoon Bay. The Montara Mountains, ending in sharp cliffs, impeded further progress up the peninsula, though the waters beyond had been identified as Vizcaino's San Francisco Bay, beyond which was Point Reyes, which, with Point Año Nuevo, incloses the Gulf of the Farallones.

The application of the name San Francisco to these waters, combined with the interposition of the bay now so named, was responsible for much of the ensuing exploration which was made during the next few years.

While the troop rested, Ortega was sent out to find a path to Point Reyes. He returned, reporting his progress cut off by the mouth of an inlet which had been seen from the ridge of the peninsula by members of the party left behind.

Now the expeditionaries left the ocean side, turned into the mountains in sight of the bay, and went southeast for two days, the bay at their left hidden by intervening hills. Emerging from the Cañada de San Andrés, which they had followed, they came out upon the Santa Clara Valley, spreading away from the head of the bay. Then they went east to a swift arroyo now called San Francisquito Creek.

Ortega was now sent out again to see whether he could make his way to Point Reyes by the east bay shore. Going on November seventh, and returning on the tenth, Ortega reported the country impassable for the expedition. He had seen an estuary, but it could hardly have been Carquines Strait, as Eldredge thought, as will presently appear.*

After consultation, the explorers now determined to return to Point Pinos and renew the search for Monterey from there. Doing so, they camped at Carmelo Bay on November 28. Having failed to identify the port, they set their cross on a little roadstead with a writing in a bottle at its foot. Another cross was planted on Monterey Bay itself, and then, on December 11, the disappointed discoverers re-ascended the Salinas River on their way to San Diego. The return route was much the same as the one over which they had come except through the Santa Susana Mountains, where they left the Santa Clara, went over into San Fernando Valley, and made their way down the Los Angeles River. They reached San Diego January 24, 1770.

There the *San Antonio* had arrived; Captain Vila, hearing the details of their search, said that Monterey was surely at the spot where the second cross had been erected. On April 16, the *San Antonio* sailed for Monterey with Fray Junípero, Costansó,

* *The March of Portolá and the Log of the San Carlos*, pp. 29 and 41, notes.

Prat, and a store of supplies. On the next day Portolá, Fages, Crespi, and their soldiers set out anew for the unfound port.

This second party followed the previous route back, and arrived at the roadstead under Point Pinos May 24. On going to visit the cross, the leaders of the expedition could now see clearly that they were on the bay they had previously visited but had not recognized. The land party was joined by the *San Antonio* in the bay on June 2.

June 3, the pioneers assembled under an oak, where Vizcaíno's Carmelites had celebrated Mass in 1602, and founded the new presidio and mission of San Carlos. On July 9, Portolá left California forever on the *San Antonio*, placing the new establishments in charge of Pedro Fages as military commander.

Left to himself in California, Lieutenant Fages in November of the same year explored northwestward from Monterey to La Cañada del Puerto de San Francisco—the Santa Clara Valley—continuing two days along the east bay shore nearly to Alameda. The route was followed later in an exploration by Fages and Crespi in 1772. Fages, in transmitting his diary of 1770 to the viceroy, says that he went about seven leagues farther than the *exploradores*—Ortega and his companions—had gone in the year previous. Since we know that the 1770 expedition did not pass the Estuary at Alameda, it is clear that the limits of Ortega's 1769 trip were much short of Mr. Eldredge's estimate.

THE FIRST RECORDED EASY BAY EXPEDITION

The 1770 expedition, consisting of Fages, six soldiers, and a muleteer, must have been with the consent, if not the urging, of Serra, though no friar went with it. The party left Monterey November 21, crossing a river after going three leagues, which Fages called the Carmelo and said that it had been erroneously called the Monterey. It was, of course, the Salinas.

On November 22, after going five leagues, they ascended a hill from which they saw a spacious valley which they entered the day following. It was the valley of the Pájaro River. Their camp was named the Parage de los Berrendos, from the antelope there.

Passing on through the Santa Clara Valley along the present route of the Coast Line of the Southern Pacific Railroad, they

camped on the twenty-sixth at the head of the bay beside a stream which may have been either the Guadalupe or Coyote Creek.

Going northeast two leagues around many branch estuaries, they passed through the present Irvington to the Lagoon, then three leagues on, to what was doubtless Alameda Creek. On November 28, four soldiers sent ahead to explore returned saying that they had gone seven leagues and had climbed a hill from which they could not see the end of an estuary before them. They had crossed two arroyos, probably San Lorenzo and San Leandro creeks. They had also seen the Golden Gate, "which entered through the bay of the port of San Francisco."⁷ This party could not have explored the east bay shore farther north than the present town of San Leandro. The return to Monterey was by the route of the outward journey.

THE SECOND EAST BAY EXPLORATION

An expedition inspired by Father Serra, who was disappointed at the delay in founding San Buenaventura because of lack of soldiers, was led to the bay in 1772 by Fages and Father Crespi. The purpose was to choose a site for the second northern mission. Fages had received in May, 1771, the viceroy's order to make such an exploration. Crespi and Fages both kept dairies of the survey.⁸

Leaving Monterey March 20, the party passed the Salinas, and, on the twenty-first, crossed and named the Arroyo de San Benito, which is still so designated. On the twenty-second, they crossed San Pascual plain and emerged into San Bernardino

⁷ FAGES, PEDRO, *Salida que hizo el theniente de Voluntarios de Cataluña Don Pedro Fages con seis soldados y un arriero*. MS., 1770, Mexico, Archivo General, Californias, Vol. 66. Printed by the Academy of Pacific Coast History in its *Publications*, Vol. 2, No. 3, H. E. Bolton, ed. This expedition was first brought to light by Bolton.

⁸ CRESPI, FR. JUAN, *Diario que se formo en el registro que se hizo del puerto de Nuestro Padre San Francisco*, in Palóu, *Noticias de la Nueva California*, Vol. iii, pp. 3-24.

FAGES, PEDRO, *Diario que se hizo desde la mission y real presidio de Señor San Carlos del puerto de Monterrey en busca del puerto de San Francisco*. . . MS., 1772, Mexico, Archivo General, Californias, Vol. 66.

Valley, as Font in 1776 called the lower Santa Clara.⁹ Their camp was to the north of Gilroy. Thence on the next day, March 23, they went northwest into the plain of "Los Robles del Puerto de San Francisco," or the Santa Clara Valley, in which Portolá's party had rested on November 7, 1769, and in which Fages had been at least twice before. On the twenty-fourth they camped near the mouth of Penitencia Creek, on the boundary between Alameda and Santa Clara counties, near the head of the bay. On the twenty-fifth they camped near Alameda Creek.

On Thursday, March 26, they crossed two large arroyos, the San Lorenzo and San Leandro creeks, after which they explored the Arroyo del Bosque, which, with another one, forms the peninsula upon which Alameda now stands. Here Crespi's latitude "about three leagues from the parallel of the mouth to the bay of the Farallones," was $37^{\circ} 54'$ north. They were actually at about $37^{\circ} 50'$. The line of $55'$ runs through Stege.

Next day the party turned east to round San Antonio Creek and went one and one half leagues over low hills now settled as East Oakland. Then passing east and north of Lake Merritt, they came out into the great plain of Oakland and Berkeley, from which they could see the Golden Gate, opposite which they stopped to study its bearings. Going on a league, they camped on Cerrito Creek, just beyond Albany. During Saturday and Sunday, they went around the shore of San Pablo Bay, through Pinole Valley, and, finally, being cut off from their march to Point Reyes by Carquines Strait, camped on the twenty-ninth on the Arroyo del Hambre near Martínez. Next day they were on Walnut Creek near Pacheco. Passing then to the left of Mount Diablo eastward through the hills, perhaps at Willow Pass, they went four or five leagues to a little stream near the San Joaquin River. This was near Antioch.

Now sure that they could not reach Point Reyes, the explorers returned to Monterey, selecting a shorter route. Cross-

⁹ *Plan o mapa del viage que hicimos desde Monterey al puerto de San Francisco 1776*. Published by John Carter Brown Library, 1911, with a description of *San Francisco Bay and California in 1776*, by IRVING BERDINE RICHMAN. The Font map of 1777, showing also the Garcés journey to Moqui and greater detail in northern Sonora, was reproduced from the California archives by the Bureau of Topographical Engineers for Elliott Coues, and printed by him as a frontispiece to *On the Trail of a Spanish pioneer*, 1900.

ing the Santa Angela Plain, they turned southeast by way of San Ramón and Amador valleys into Sunol (they called it Santa Coleta) Valley. Thence, by way of Mission Creek perhaps, they emerged in the vicinity of Mission San José, finding the track of their outward journey. They camped on a stream which Crespi called San Francisco de Paula, presumably Milpitas or Penitencia Creek, in the vicinity of Milpitas. On April 5, they reached San Carlos Mission.

THE "PROCESSION OF MISSIONS"

Although foundation of San Gabriel and San Buenaventura had been deemed impossible due to lack of soldiers, the Franciscans were able to render their tenure of the country more firm by beginning San Antonio de Padua July 14, 1771, in the Santa Lucía region, near where the Portolá expedition camped on Wednesday, September 20, 1769. Its establishment entailed no new exploration. San Gabriel Arcángel was made possible by the coming in July of twenty more soldiers. The site originally chosen for this mission was at or near the point where Portolá first crossed the Santa Ana River, but the Indians there proved hostile and the situation was unfavorable, hence the present site was chosen, and the mission erected September 8. The ground has often been visited, and the new establishment was but an added link in the chain of missions. Such also was San Luis Obispo de Tolosa, added September 1, 1772. There were now five missions. Three years were to elapse before there could be another.

THE PROBLEM OF MAINTENANCE

The expansion into California, a project received with doubtful enthusiasm by the Fernandines at first, was indeed proving difficult to maintain.¹⁰ Self-support was yet out of the question; supplies from Mexico had to hazard a long sea voyage or the difficult gulf and peninsula route. Hence permanency had to be assured by some improvement of connection. The number of missionaries must also be increased. The latter was effected in 1772, by giving the peninsular missions to the Dominicans, releasing several new men for the north. The problem of connection was studied in a practical manner, by Captain Juan Bautista de Anza.

¹⁰ Correspondence of Father Verger, guardian of the College of San Fernando. British Museum, MS. Vol. 13, p. 974, Section G.

THE OVERLAND ROUTE FROM SONORA

This man had gained his knowledge of the frontier in fighting Indians from his eighteenth year. His father and grandfather had been presidio captains; he himself had taken part in the Sonora wars of 1768-71, and was, at the time of the 1769 expeditions, lieutenant of the presidio of Tubac. Like his father, he had long wanted to make conquests on the Gila and Colorado. In 1769, he had asked Gálvez to permit him to lead a party to Monterey to meet Portolá by going across the desert. He believed this practicable from information he had obtained from the Pima Indians and from the great Franciscan explorer, Father Garcés.

This missionary took charge of San Xavier del Bac at the time of the Jesuit expulsion, and became both spiritual and geographical legatee of Kino, Keller, and Sedelmayr. Father Kino had reached the Gila River in 1694, 1697, and 1698. In 1694, he passed over the route used by Anza in 1775-76. Again in 1699, Kino went to the Gila over the route Anza followed in 1774, between Sonoitac and the Gila Range. Anza no doubt had a map by Kino, whose travels he mentioned. Between the two men were the Jesuits Ignacio Keller and Jacobo Sedelmayr, followed by the Franciscan Garcés, all interested in the plan for spiritual conquests in the Gila-Colorado region.

THE DISCOVERIES OF FATHER GARCÉS

When it was seen how precarious was the supply of the new establishments by the inadequate ship service, Anza renewed his request to make the overland expedition from Sonora. It was supported by Serra, consented to by the king, and approved by the viceroy. Anza was ordered to open a road to Monterey, and to take with him Fathers Garcés and Juan Diaz. To explain the order sending Garcés, it is only necessary to revert to his activities on the desert frontier from the time of his assignment to San Xavier del Bac in 1768. The journeys of 1768 and 1770, were of minor importance; those of 1771 and 1774, were by way of prelude to the important one of 1775-76.¹¹

¹¹ GARCÉS, FR. FRANCISCO, *Diario que se ha formado por el viage hecho á el Rio Gila quando los Yndios Pimas Gileños me llamaron á fin de que baptisase sus hijos*

The first *entrada*, beginning August 29, 1768, was from San Xavier del Bac to the Gila and to the Pima village of Pitiaque, just below the Casa Grande. The second one, beginning October 18, 1770, was to the Pápago villages of Cuitcoat, Oapars, and Tubasa. Going west through Aquitún, he reached the Gila at Pitiaque, and continued down to Napcut, Sutaquisón and to Uparsoitac on Gila Bend. A report of this journey was sent to José de Gálvez; this resulted in deliberations concerning new establishments on the Gila, and another *entrada* was planned. This third journey was to the Gila and Colorado in 1771, to search for mission sites. The pioneer left Bac August 8, and traveled west, baptizing the moribund, through the Papaguería to Sonoitac, and thence over the Camino del Diablo to the Yumas on the Gila. From that point he traveled, during September, nearly to the mouth of the Colorado. Then he went northwestward parallel with the Cócopa Mountains, to San Jacome near New River and the Cerro Prieto. Then northward, he went on until he sighted the San Jacinto Mountains in Southern California, and the San Felipe Pass which Anza was to follow. Garcés was the first known white man to cross the Yuma and Colorado Deserts.

It was very natural, then, that this Father should accompany Anza on his road-opening expedition as far as San Gabriel. His companion religious, Fray Juan Díaz, kept a diary of the expe-

que estaban enfermos del sarampión (1770). Mexico, Archivo General, *Californias*. Vol. 36.

— — —, *Diario que se ha formado con la ocasion de la entrada que hize a los secinos gentiles*, 1771. *Idem*.

— — —, *Diario de la entrada que se practica de orden del excelentísimo Señor Virrey Don Antonio Maria Bucareli y Ursua producida en junta de guerra i real hacienda á fin de abrir camino por los rios Gila y Colorado para los nueros establecimientos de San Diego y Monterey* . . . 1775. Mexico, Archivo General, *Historia*, Vol. 24.

Prior to Elliott Coues, the authority on the explorations of Garcés was ARRICIVITA, in his *Crónica seráfica y apostolica del Colegio de Propaganda Fide de la Santa Cruz de Querétaro en la Nueva España* . . . 1792. Coues abstracted Arricivita's accounts of the Garcés *entradas* between 1768 and 1774 as a preliminary to the translation and annotation of the fifth, in *On the trail of a Spanish pioneer*. The confusion of Garcés as to his whereabouts during his third *entrada*, which misled Arricivita and Coues, is cleared up by BOLTON, "The early explorations of Father Garcés on the Pacific Slope," in *The Pacific Ocean in history*, H. M. Stephens and H. E. Bolton, eds., 1917.

dition, in addition to the one by Garcés cited above, and that of Anza himself.¹²

THE FIRST ANZA EXPEDITION

Anza, Garcés, Díaz, an Indian guide named Sebastián Tarabal, who had been with Garcés before and had escaped across the desert from San Gabriel, set out with soldiers, from Tubac presidio January 8, 1774. Their route lay through San Ignacio, the valley of Arivca, Agua Escondida, Saric on the Altar River, Oquitoa, Pitic, Caborca, San Ildefonso, Aribaipa, Quitobac, and Sonóitac. Thence they followed the Sonóitac River to its sink, and on northwest over the Camino del Diablo and the Yuma Desert to the Gila and Colorado, which they crossed on February 9.

In three or four days the party had reached the Cajuenche town of Santa Olalla—Anza's wife's name was Eulalia, and the name was applied to the town at this time—nine and one half leagues about southwest. Delayed here until March 2, Anza left much of his equipment and some animals and set out through the Cajuenche villages which Garcés had visited in 1771. Finding water scant, they attempted to reach San Jacome, which Garcés had visited two years before. Missing it, they returned to Santa Olalla. Again setting forth with lighter equipment and fewer men, they went down the Colorado valley and turned west northwest toward the Cócopa Mountains, in which they spent the night of March 6, at some springs about ten miles below the international line. Next day they reached Yuha Springs, four miles north of the line. Now they knew they were to succeed in crossing the desert. Going north along the ancient beach line, they reached the sink of the San Felipe River at the base of the San Jacinto Mountains. Going up the river, they came, after threading some smaller canyons, upon the summit of San Jacinto Mountain at a flat which they named San Carlos Pass. From there the party passed into Hemet Valley, naming the lake La

¹² DÍAZ, FR. JUAN MARCELO, *Diario que forma el Padre Juan Diaz, misionero apostolico del Colegio de la Santa Cruz de Queretaro, en el viage que hace en compañía del R. P. Fray Francisco Garcés para abrir camino desde la Provincia de la Sonora á la California Septentrional y puerto de Monterrey por los Rios Gila y Colorado* . . . 1774. Mexico, Archivo General, *Historia*, Vol. 396.

ANZA, JUAN BAUTISTA, *Diario del viage del Capitan Anza a Monterrey, con copia de sus cartas y de una declaracion relativa a sucesos del mismo viage*. Seville, Archivo General de Indias, Estante 104, cajón 3, legajo 4.

Laguna del Príncipe. Going on to the San Jacinto River, they named its Lake La Laguna de San Antonio de Bucareli.

On March 21, Anza reached the Santa Ana River, and marched along it for a league and a half looking for a ford, but had finally to construct a bridge to pass it. On the next night they camped on San Antonio Creek northeast of the present Pomona, and in another day reached San Gabriel. The remainder of the road to Monterey was practically the same as Portolá had taken.

The successful pathfinder returned southward from Monterey on April 22, taking six of Fages' soldiers to teach them the route to the Gila and Colorado. On March 4, he saw what was possibly the opening of San Timoteo Canyon and San Gorgonio Pass, and thought that through it might lie a good route to Sonora. Following the Gila and the Santa Cruz, he reached Tubac, from which he had started. He had conquered the desert, uniting the far-flung points of the Spanish occupation. He had made possible the establishment of the northernmost outpost, the presidio and mission of San Francisco, where Church and State were to clasp hands to hold half a continent against Russia for God and the King.

HERBERT INGRAM PRIESTLEY, PH.D.,
University of California,
Berkeley, Cal.

(To be continued)

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE CHURCH IN LITTLE ROCK

Printed books throw very little light on the beginnings of Catholicity in the city of Little Rock. From letters and other documents which lay hidden in the archives of the chancery office at St. Louis, we have collected some information which is new, at least in part. We shall not go far beyond these documents, since it is not our intention to write a complete history of these beginnings, but only to furnish material hitherto inaccessible.

Nor do we purpose to enter into the early history of Catholicity in the Territory which attaches itself to the Fort of Arkansas Post, and to the valiant missionaries from the Society of Jesus and the Seminary of Quebec who, since the last decade of the seventeenth century, sailed down the Mississippi to minister to the Canadian trappers and hunters, and to the Indian tribes. We begin our story with the period following the Louisiana Purchase (1803).

The first priest who, after the cessation of the Spanish regime, came to the forlorn mission of the flood-beaten Post of Arkansas, was a certain Father Chauderat, who is often mentioned in the letters of the later missionaries. He confined his activities to the Post and Pine Bluff. Without any canonical mission he had come over from Kentucky, and remained from the spring of 1820 to the spring of 1821.

The next missionary, sent by Bishop Rosati, coadjutor of Bishop Du Bourg of Louisiana, was the Lazarist Father Odin.¹ In his letter to the Propagation of the Faith he states that he and the subdeacon Timon, C. M.,² reached the Arkansas River near Little Rock, in the fall of 1824:

Having spent a few days with five French families, 18 miles from Davidsonville, Ark., we directed our steps to Bate (*Batesville*) on the White River and towards Petit Rocher (*Little Rock*), a small town built on the bank of the Arkansas River and seat of the government. We were favorably received by the Catholics of the neighborhood, who never had been visited by a priest.

Having spent some time in missionary work with the Qapwa

¹In 1842, FATHER ODIN was appointed Vicar-Apostolic of Texas; in 1861, Archbishop of New Orleans; died May 25, 1870.

² Bishop of Buffalo, 1847-1867.

(Kappa) Indians near the Post of Arkansas, they returned to the diocesan Seminary at the Barrens, in Perry Co., Mo.³

Whilst Bishop Rosati of St. Louis was still Administrator of the Diocese of New Orleans, he sent Father John Martin from Avoyelles, La., to the deserted and disorderly mission on the Arkansas. The distinguished botanist, Thomas Nuttall, who visited Arkansas in 1819, comments unfavorably upon the generality of those who inhabited the bank of the Arkansas; he found that every reasonable and rational amusement appeared to be swallowed up in dram-drinking, jockeying, and gambling; the more industrious and honest suffered from the dishonest practices of their indolent neighbors, renegadoes from justice, who had fled from honest society.⁴ Father Martin, commissioned by Rosati, June 13, 1829,⁵ spent some months amongst the neglected Creoles, and also visited the Catholic colonists near the State Capital, but he was a man of a scrupulous and stubborn disposition, absolutely unfit to gain the confidence of the ignorant settlers. When he left, they showed their aversion by slandering him outrageously.⁶

In November, 1831, Bishop Rosati of St. Louis, to whose diocese Arkansas belonged, sent two priests who were to fix their residence somewhere on the Arkansas River and stay there: the Gascon, Edmund Saulnier, formerly (1819) professor at St. Louis Academy and pro-rector of the Cathedral, and the young Fleming, Peter F. Beauprez. They arrived at the Post of Arkansas on December 16, 1831. The same winter Father Saulnier in his letters to the bishop mentions Little Rock repeatedly:

It would be good to have a priest at Little Rock; there are many ignorant Protestants there and very few Catholics; but a priest would have to know English well and be a good controversialist. Three priests, I believe, would for the moment be sufficient in the Territory; one at the Post, one at Pine Bluff, and one at Little Rock.⁷

"I wrote to the Governor, who answers as follows:

³ *Annales de la Prop. de la Foi*, II, p. 374.

⁴ *Cath. Encycl.*, I, p. 725.

⁵ *Ephemerides* of Bishop Rosati.

⁶ Letter of Dupuy, January 7, 1833.

⁷ Letter of Saulnier, December 24, 1831. The letters of Saulnier, Dupuy and Richard-Bole are all written in French and were translated in English for this sketch.

Little Rock, Jan. 12th, 1832.

Dear Sir:

I have this moment received yours of the 29th of this month & hasten to answer you that I will make some enquiry about the land described in your memorandum. I am gratified to learn that you are about to establish a church in this remote region. Many of my Catholic friends in Nelson and Washington Counties in Kentucky, would remove here immediately, if a church was established at this place. Permit me to say that you may expect from me kindness and liberality, for you know that the *Pope* and the Priests have ever worked in harmony. I have the honor to be Most Rev. Sir,

Your obdt. Servant,

JOHN POPE.

Mark the allusion which he makes of his name with the Pope. I wrote to him again, telling him that I would communicate to you his desire and to learn, if you wish to send another priest or send me. I do not think that it would be well for me to go, because I do not speak English well enough. . . . Since Little Rock is a place where all are English, where there are several lawyers, where the Legislature always meets, and where there are several Protestant ministers, an Englishman or Irishman is needed, *e. g.*, Mr. McMahon, perhaps also Mr. Lutz would do.*

Three priests would not be too many; one at the Post, another at Pine Bluff, and an "Anglais" at Little Rock.†

Census of Catholics in Arkansas, taken by Father Martin, in January, 1830:

	<i>Whites</i>	<i>Negroes</i>
Post of Arkansas.....	247	108
Jefferson Co.....	204	60
Petit Rocher.....	38	3
Fort Smith.....	33	3
Total.....	522	174

His census to me does not seem to be very exact; there may be one thousand and more.¹⁰

Father Saulnier never left the Post of Arkansas to visit the colonists further up the river. Father Beauprez, in January,

* Father John McMahon was the first Irish priest ordained for St. Louis, November 20, 1831. He died at Galena, Ill., June 19, 1833. Father Jos. Ant. Lutz, b. at Odenheim, Baden, Germany, since 1828 had attended Indian Missions in Kansas, Wisconsin and Iowa. Since 1832 he was stationed at the Cathedral of St. Louis; he spoke English tolerably well and, in summer 1831, had been selected for the Arkansas Mission, but never went there. He died at New York in 1861.

† Letter of Saulnier, February 27, 1833.

¹⁰ Letter of Saulnier, April 9, 1832.

1832, opened a mission a few miles below Pine Bluff, but never went as far as Little Rock. Utterly disgusted, before the end of the year, both left Arkansas, "this suburb of hell," as Beauprez called it, Saulnier July 14, to return to his beloved St. Louis, Beauprez October 25, to descend to Donaldson, La.¹¹

In October, 1832, Bishop Rosati appointed Father Annemond Dupuy, from Lyon, France, to Arkansas.¹² The Catholics of the Post made such an unfavorable impression upon him that he left them and fixed his residence below Pine Bluff, where Father Beauprez had opened his mission. From there he wrote to Rosati, January 7, 1833:

I did not go to Little Rock, but I received all possible information about the place. It seems, after all they tell me, that I cannot make an establishment there with the means I have. Therefore I came to the conclusion to stay at Pine Bluff.

It seems Rosati advised him to establish himself at the capital of the Territory, Little Rock. There somebody had donated land to the Bishop of St. Louis to found a Catholic center, but no one knew in what section the land was situated. Father Dupuy, after the great flood of 1833, had made a futile attempt at collecting at St. Louis. Descending to New Orleans on board the steamer *St. Louis*, August 23, 1833, he wrote a letter to his bishop in which he again mentioned the land at Little Rock:

We have forgotten several things: (1) You did not give me the deed of your land at Little Rock. What shall I do to get it? I thought you might send it to me by the *Missourian*. Perhaps I shall yet be at New Orleans when it arrives. Hence you must send it to Mr. Blanc and ask him to transmit it to me if I am gone.

He again speaks of Little Rock in a number of letters dated from Pine Bluff:

When I arrived here, I found my hut nearly destroyed by the overflow. . . I was determined to go straight to Little Rock and settle there, but because I have not the deed to your land in the place, and since I see, just now, better dispositions than ever in the divers hamlets along the Arkansas, I resolved, with your kind permission, to work principally here, this year. I cannot see, however, without an ardent desire to rush into battle, that the Capital of this Territory which soon

¹¹ Various letters of Saulnier and Beauprez.

¹² Ephemerides of Bishop Rosati.

will be a State, be without a *House of God*, whilst two caverns of (? , illegible) are erected there.¹³

Little Rock grows from day to day. Catholics, they say, some French, some Dutch, have arrived in this Territory and settle in the neighborhood of Little Rock.¹³

Your land in this Territory is 36 miles from Little Rock. The soil is poor, and only a few settlers live near it. I doubt, whether for a long time there will be enough people there to build a chapel. It is not far from the road from Little Rock to Batesville. It would be best, in my opinion, to found the establishment in the town of Little Rock; it grows daily; it is the Capital of the Territory. Otherwise the preachers will take possession of it. The Catholics who are there, about 200 "Dutch" [meaning "*German*"] go to their "preaching," because there is no priest. Many have urged me to go there, but I would need at least six hundred dollars to build a chapel of wood. It would be a great pity to leave the place where I am now, because there are many people in this neighborhood; besides, up to this day, it is the center of Catholicity. The Post isn't anything; it is depopulating fast; besides, they are a lot of libertines. The heat oppresses me; I cannot work at anything; still, by the help of God, I have not been sick as yet.

Yesterday I had a wedding, the first since I am in this mission. When I came here, the people believed that the marriages contracted before a priest were no good.¹⁴

At last, in the summer, of 1834, Father Dupuy undertook the journey to Little Rock, two years and a half after the reestablishment of the Arkansas Mission by Bishop Rosati. He writes about this trip, August 7, 1834:

I have just returned from a journey to Petit Rocher (Little Rock), satisfied in every respect. I found about twenty Catholic families in the neighborhood, separated some 20 miles from each other. They earnestly ask for a priest and complain that You desert them; and, feeling the necessity of serving a *Supreme Being* and not being able to have the instruction required, they are compelled to receive it from the mouth of a false minister. Most of these Catholics have subscribed for two Presbyterian churches at Little Rock; one, of wood, is finished; the other, of brick, is not completed. In the city itself no Catholic could be shown to me, but there are said to be three families, who, seeing they were abandoned, did not declare themselves Catholics. About twenty German families had settled here, but about a month or two ago, they went 12 miles higher up the river. The city of Little Rock is superbly situated. Placed on a small hill on the right bank of the river Arkansas,

¹³ Letter of Dupuy, December 26, 1833.

¹³ Letter of Dupuy, April 20, 1834.

¹⁴ Letter of Dupuy, July 9, 1834.

the city dominates an immense plain on both sides of the river. Most of the land is laid in very rich cotton fields. All the bottoms bristle with cypress forests, of which boards are made in large quantities; these are transported to New Orleans. The people here are very gentle, but the prejudice against the true religion is deeply rooted. Numbers of these circuit riding preachers pass here; all they do is spread calumnies against the Church. It is incredible, Monseigneur, in what perplexity these poor people are. The Protestants are mostly Deists, and the Catholics are not very far from the same condition, so much so, that several of them neglect to have their children baptized. Amongst those whom I visited, and who have not seen a priest since the coming of Father Martin, I baptized only one infant. But I am sure, that, if a priest came here, he would soon overcome the prejudices and refute the calumnies. But he will have to go through sufferings of every kind. A person must have been here to understand. . . In my third letter I asked you, if You want me to go to New Orleans this year or to St. Louis, or rather, if you shall send a priest on a tour of inspection through Arkansas. This, Monseigneur, I would wish to know, if You would be kind enough to answer. I cannot help to be restless in a country filled with scandals as this is. Before I started for Little Rock, I rose from a sickness which kept me in bed a week. A great many thought that I was dead. I was somewhat afraid myself, being such a distance from another priest.

Father Dupuy did not say Mass during his short stay in and near Little Rock. In the spring of 1835, Bishop Rosati sent an assistant to Father Dupuy, Rev. Charles Rolle, a native of Lorraine, who had recently been ordained in St. Louis. But the young priest, not being acclimated, died after a short illness, July 22, 1835. In August, Father Dupuy himself suffered an attack of bilious fever and was again so ill that his recovery was despaired of. On August 11, 1835, he sent the following letter to the bishop:

It is only a few days since I wrote to you, but I have to write again the subject of this letter being so important. It is to remind you, Monseigneur, of what I had already told you, that at Little Rock several Protestants desire to have a Catholic Church. I heard people talk of it several times, but I never have been accosted directly. . . They used a roundabout way to let me know of it, but when they saw that I paid no attention to the talk and learned that I was preparing to build a chapel at Pine Bluff, the wealthiest man, as they say, of the Territory, Mr. Chester Ashley, having inquired about me from my neighbors, makes to me, through one of his friends, Sam Roane, a rich, respectable and prudent man, the following proposition:

If I desire to go to Little Rock, or if you wish to send another talented

Catholic priest, he gives¹⁸ twelve lots of land in the city of Little Rock, optionally, where I would think the location was best, either all together in the same location, or in different parts of the city (I wish to remark that nearly half of the city belongs to him). Besides, for five years he will give fifty dollars in cash, and all this without putting any restraint on the liberty of the Catholic cult. On the contrary, he will do me the favor to let me have the lots at the price at which they are sold at present in Little Rock. I estimate the cost to be about two thousand dollars.

The condition he makes is, that a permanent school be erected for both sexes; from an explanation given me of his idea I conclude that it would be sufficient if I could get Sisters for the girls, and I myself would teach the boys.

Now, Monseigneur, what answer shall I give him? In the meantime I wrote that I would place his proposition before you, and that I would send him your answer. If I am permitted, Monseigneur, to give you my own idea, I would say that I really believe that Divine Providence by this offer relieves our poverty, which at this hour is our only obstacle, it seems, in Arkansas.

If, therefore, Monseigneur, you could send us two or three Sisters from the convent of Mr. Timon—I suppose it would take three of them because there are many to instruct, three who are well trained, for the people here are very much stuck up. Then, send me an assistant whose mother tongue is English. Nothing else is required in him to succeed, but to speak English well, to have sound logic, unshaken courage, invincible constancy and great prudence; with these qualities and the help of God we could accomplish all the good I hope for. . . .

Having received no answer to this letter, Father Dupuy, in October, 1835, personally went to St. Louis, to find that the Bishop could not enter upon the plans of Mr. Chester Ashley. To establish a school in a town so remote and at such an expense when the religious orders at St. Louis were short of teachers, was too perilous a venture. Father Dupuy returned to Pine Bluff sick in body and soul. His people, however, insisted that by all means they must have a school. On January 19, Dupuy wrote to his Bishop:

They have repeatedly asked to know, if they cannot have a school here. If you cannot establish one here, they insist on having one at Little Rock. Since you refused the offers which they made to me,

¹⁸ "Donnera," "he will give." It seems, however, this was by no means an absolute donation, as appears from the following passage of the letter which we give in the original French: "Il me favorisera à prendre les terres comme elles se vendent à présent au Petit Rocher. J'estime cela à plus de deux milles piastres."

they now, at Little Rock, build a college which will be governed, "dogmatized" and "moralized" by Protestants alone.

November 24, 1836, whilst Dupuy was at St. Louis to urge his claim for an assistant, Bishop Rosati appointed Rev. Peter Donnelly to aid him in the missionary field on the Arkansas River. Father Donnelly¹⁶ at once saw, that Dupuy's missionary system was ineffective and that radical changes were required. Wherefore, August 15, 1837, he abruptly took a boat to St. Louis. The result of this journey was, that Bishop Rosati, being "very much displeased" with Father Dupuy, on September 2, appointed Father Donnelly pastor of the missions on the Arkansas, and permitted Dupuy to leave the diocese and repair to New Orleans. The latter, deeply wounded by Donnelly's action, left for St. John the Baptist's, La., at the end of October 1837.¹⁷

Father Donnelly, no doubt, was a good collector and was also otherwise, at least in the beginning, successful in his labors. He saw, however, that the barren missionary field was too extensive for one man. He wrote to Bishop Rosati February 19, 1838:

I cannot go on as I would wish without someone to assist me. If I had one that would attend to New Gascony and the Post, I would commence another subscription at Little Rock for a church. I spoke to some on the subject. I hope we will prosper. It is true, the number of Catholics are few, but one must not be discouraged at that.

On March 23, 1838, Father Donnelly undertook his first journey to Little Rock. He writes about it from Little Rock, March 26:

Most Reverend and Dear Father in Jesus Christ:

With what pleasure and gratification do I look forward to that approaching day, when I hope to have the consolation of seeing Your

¹⁶ Having been educated on the Continent of Europe, Father Donnelly spoke French, but since he had never received any training in the English language, the spelling in his letters is very faulty and follows the sounds of the Irish brogue.

¹⁷ Father Dupuy's unexpected departure split the Catholics of Jefferson Co. into two camps: Antoine Barraqué of New Gascony was the leader of the friends of Father Donnelly, John Dodge and others favored Father Dupuy. From that period there are four petitions in the chancery archives of St. Louis, ranging from August to November, 1837. Also the Catholics and other citizens of Little Rock, hearing that an Irish priest had arrived in Arkansas, sent two petitions to Bishop Rosati, December 16, 1837, and November 22, 1838, asking for a priest and the erection of a Catholic church in their town.

Lordship visit me, so far distant from You! I hope you will feel satisfied with what is done and the prospects that offer.

I arrived at Little Rock on the 23d, in the morning, and after visiting some of the citizens on the 24th, I commenced my subscription, which runs thus:

We, the subscribers, whose names are affixed hereunto promise, bind and oblige ourselves to pay the sums annexed to our names for the purpose of purchasing a lot of ground and building a church in or at the City of Little Rock, under the superintendence of the Bishop of St. Louis or his agent, for the use and benefit of the Catholics of Little Rock and adjoining country.

Witness our hands, etc.

<i>Subscribers' names, Protestants</i>		<i>Subscribers' names, Catholics</i>	
Charles Ashley.....	\$100.00	Hewes Scull.....	\$50.00
Judge Cross.....	50.00	D. W. Carroll.....	50.00
Captain Collins.....	50.00	Jacob Rider.....	100.00
J. H. Tucker.....	50.00	S. Marchong.....	50.00
L. M. Lincoln.....	25.00		
J. C. De Bauer.....	50.00		
W. Woodruff.....	25.00		
Jud. Johnson.....	50.00		

Thus far the encouragement that we have at Little Rock and the fruit of our day's labor! If I could but spend twelve or fifteen days in this city, that I might have an opportunity to make acquaintances, I would get a good subscription. It is my opinion that this place offers the best prospect of any other place of the description in America. The Catholics are but few, still I am discovering Catholics every day and persons that were considered heretofore to be Protestants.

Mr. Dugan, in whose house I stop, requests me to give you his best respects and hopes that he will have the pleasure of seeing you in Little Rock. It was in his house I said the first Mass. Mr. George Taafe of Rocky Comfort requests and hopes you will send him a few lines, letting him know when you expect to be at St. Mary's, Jefferson Co., and he and Mr. Foran expect to meet you there.

I close these few lines by requesting Your Grace's blessing.

I remain Your humble and obedient son in Jesus Christ,

PETER DONNELLY.

This letter proves that the first Mass celebrated at Little Rock was said by Rev. Peter Donnelly, in Mr. Dugan's house at the end of March, 1838.¹⁵ But the progress of the work was slow, owing principally to the illness of Father Donnelly. On November 28, 1838, he writes again:

¹⁵ Perhaps this first Mass was celebrated on the feast of the Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

I hasten to give you some idea of my labor since my return, which is very trivial, owing to the delicate state of my health which at this moment is very indifferent and has been so since I returned, so much so that I was not able to preach more than twice during the last six weeks. . . . This month has been unusually cold, which causes me to feel much worse.

I visited Little Rock twice since my return. On my second visit I commenced to collect part of the subscription to pay for the lots, but was obliged to abandon it on account of my indisposition. What I collected, I left in the hands of Mr. Dugan, from whom I bought the lots, except "a trifle that I spent" in going up and down and during my stay there. I had no money left after returning home; what I had I was obliged to advance on the Sisters' passage and other expenses contracted by them. . . .¹⁹

Another letter is dated December 12, 1838:

. . . if my health continues to decline as it has, since I saw you, I think my hour is not far distant. Thanks be to God for all things! If I do not get better in spring or when the warm weather comes, I will be obliged to quit the mission and return to St. Louis. When I was at Little Rock the last time, the Legislature was then sitting. I had a bill presented for the incorporation of church property. I have not yet heard what the result was or if it passed. . . .

In the spring of 1839, he writes:

I was at Little Rock in the fore part of the week, collecting some money to pay for the lots which I bought. I collected and paid 450 dollars; there remain 254 dollars to be paid as yet. I was so ill that I could not remain to collect the entire amount. I got home on the 23d and had to keep my bed on the 24th, but feel somewhat better today. Necessity compels me to depart for the Post tomorrow. . . . I was in expectation that by this time the other priests²⁰ would be here, as you mention in your last letter. . . . The number of Catholics is increasing daily at Little Rock. There are several families that came within the last month. It is said there are many more coming from Vicksburg; they have heard it said that there was a church to be built at Little Rock shortly. A good opportunity offers if it be only attended to. I hope and pray that Almighty God may enable you in making a good

¹⁹ From Ste. Genevieve in 1838, Sister Agnes Hart, with two other Sisters went to Pine Bluff, where St. Mary's Convent School was opened, October 11, 1838. A year later, August 20, 1839, she passed from the scenes of her earthly labors to find eternal rest. The school was continued until 1842, when the Sisters moved to St. Ambrose, Post of Arkansas. (ANNA C. MINOGUE, *Loretto, Annals of the Century*, New York, 1812.)

²⁰ Fathers I. Richard-Bole and A. S. Paris.

selection or appointment for that city, who will complete St. Peter's church in the Rock and on the Rock, which I may say is now begun. . .²¹

Father Donnelly's health was so precarious that he asked Bishop Rosati for permission to go to Ireland. The bishop notes down in his official Ephemerides, that May 21, 1839, he permitted Rev. Peter Donnelly to return to Ireland and that the same day, he appointed Father Joseph Richard-Bole pastor of the Arkansas missions, and Father Aug. Simon Paris his assistant. These two priests, with Rev. Franc. Jos. Renaud, had arrived in St. Louis from France, November 16, 1838; all three had been parish priests in the diocese of Besançon. As soon as Richard-Bole arrived at Pine Bluff, he took an inventory in which he also mentions the mission at Little Rock (June 13, 1839):

Mr. Donnelly has opened a subscription at Little Rock. Twenty-nine subscribers gave their names for a sum of 1,030 dollars. Mr. Donnelly has received 505 dollars; of them he remitted 455 dollars to Mr. Diogen²² (this Mr. Diogen is that Irishman who built a house at St. Mary's on the church land), for two lots of land situated in the city of Little Rock which he bought to build a church. This Mr. Diogen sold these two lots to Mr. Donnelly for one thousand dollars and at the same time subscribed 250 dollars for the church, so that the real price of the land bought from Mr. Diogen is 750 dollars. When the land is paid for, there will remain 300 dollars for the building of the church which he promised to commence very soon.

Mr. Donnelly has remitted to us an act by which Mr. Crosse gives ten acres of land a mile and a quarter from Little Rock. This land is to be used for the construction of a church subject to the will of his Lordship, the Bishop of St. Louis.

It had been Father Donnelly's intention to return to Ireland, but he changed his mind. Probably he had not expected that his rash resignation would be acted upon by the bishop so promptly. He stayed about the mission for some time to the great chagrin of Father Richard-Bole. Then he went to St. Louis and was appointed pastor of Gravois (Kirkwood), January 31, 1840. Father Richard-Bole, the new pastor, did not go to Little Rock before October, four months after his arrival in Arkansas. He writes, October 29, 1839:

²¹ Letter of Donnelly, May 26, 1839.

²² Mr. A. G. Dugan, in whose house the first Mass was celebrated at Little Rock.

I have been at Little Rock last week. I am convinced that Mr. Donnelly has spoiled everything there by his wild promises, which he could not realize and which are difficult to carry out. He has received 505 dollars; he bought a plot of land for one thousand dollars and with this asset he wanted to build church, school, etc. Wherewith? With the money he expects from Your Lordship and with the collections he intended to take up at New York, St. Louis, New Orleans, etc. At first, when we came, he was glad to see us. But when we spoke to him of his promises, impossible to realize with empty wishes, where there are no means to accomplish them, he changed his behavior. I told him that great things will be wrought here, because man in them, it seems, shall be nothing: God will do it all.

Visiting the Catholics, I found several families with a dozen of unbaptized children of every age. It will be necessary to pass several days with such Catholics to work amongst them with a good will. I have heard them say: I don't want to be Catholic any more; so totally have they been neglected. I speak here of Catholics who live on the farms in the vicinity of Little Rock. I believe that in and around Little Rock there are at least a hundred and fifty of them. A priest who labors here cannot count on the people for several years, but must rely on the aid of the Propaganda. I say, if there is any mission who needs such aid, it is this one.

In spite of our poverty we need someone to share it with us. The work grows too abundant, two are not sufficient for it. I want to tell you, however, that I have induced the faithful of St. Mary's to give 250 dollars a year; they shall try to make it 300 dollars and 250 bushel of corn; at New Gascony they shall give 200 dollars and about 100 bushels of corn; both will build a house.

There was some trouble between Mr. Dugan and the people at the Pine Bluff Mission on account of a house which Dugan, following the advice of his friend, Father Donnelly, had built on the church property and which they threatened to take away from him.²³ It seems, Father Richard-Bole was in contention

²³ A. G. Dugan (not Duggan) came from Zanesville, Ohio, to Little Rock in 1837. His wife was a daughter of Richard Noble, "a convert Catholic near Brownsville, Pa., whose house, heart and purse was always open to priests and religious as they passed, and was made a general resting place on their journey east and west." At Little Rock he became acquainted with Father Donnelly who, when at Little Rock, enjoyed Dugan's hospitality. He was induced to move his family and store to St. Mary's, Pine Bluff, by Father Donnelly, Creed Taylor (a convert of Father Dupuy), F. N. Vangine and others. Upon consultation with Father Donnelly he built a house on an unenclosed corner of the church land. Father Donnelly said: "that there must be a house built for the priest at all events and that if Dugan found that the place would not suit him, the house would answer the purpose and the congregation would take it at what it cost Dugan." (Letter of A. G. Dugan to Bishop Rosati, September 12, 1839). Dugan at the time was not aware that the

with Dugan also about the church property at Little Rock. In his letter of November 19, 1839, he says:

But there exists another difficulty with Dugan on account of the two lots which Mr. Donnelly bought from him. The two lots cost Mr. Dugan 700 dollars; Mr. Donnelly bought them for a thousand dollars. I was told that Dugan still held a deed of trust on them. When I found this to be true and when I spoke to Mr. Dugan about it, he demanded immediate payment. I told him, he should give me a quit claim deed or some security, that he should let us have the land at the price he paid for it, or return the money he had already received, but he would not consent to either demand.

I was astonished to see on the land at Little Rock a worthless house, rented at five dollars a month. Mr. Dugan and Donnelly never mentioned this to me. Donnelly drew the rent.

Monseigneur, the conduct of Mr. Donnelly appears inexplicable to me. It shows duplicity, absolutely no delicacy. Regarding the affair with Mr. Dugan, I do not know how to settle it. He wants what he wants. He does not show to me the same face as to Mr. Donnelly with whom he has done good business—nor is he as religious a man as you were told. I can prove this assertion as everything else I said before.

Permit me, Monseigneur, to say that Mr. Dugan wrote to you, only because we could not grant him all he wanted.²⁴ Therefore he saw fit to make a false statement of the case; and this statement was confirmed by the testimony of a priest²⁵ who puts himself in contradiction with himself and in opposition to trustworthy witnesses and places our administration in conflict with that of Your Lordship.

It is hard for us to find ourselves in such a position, especially in a country where so many things have happened which disparage the priests and rob them of the people's confidence. Mr. Donnelly is not one of the least guilty ones in this respect.

I retain the letter of Mr. Dugan; he does not know that I have it; he has the one which is destined for me. . . .²⁶

laws of Arkansas gave the owner of land a title to all improvements made on it, without a written contract to the contrary. Depending on this state law the congregation, or rather Taylor and Vangine who controlled the affairs of St. Mary's Mission, tried to take the house from Dugan without any compensation. They would not allow him to move the house to a small piece of land he had purchased a quarter of a mile below the church grounds. Father "Bowl" (Richard-Bole) refused to interfere. This is Dugan's statement of the case. Father Richard-Bole, however, in his letter of November 19, says that this statement is false. The Dugan family was well acquainted with Bishops Flaget and Purcell, with Revs. Montgomery, Young and Badin. Dugan's well-written letter is preserved in the archives of the chancery office of St. Louis.

²⁴ Father Richard-Bole is referring to Dugan's letter to Rosati, mentioned before.

²⁵ Father Donnelly.

²⁶ It seems, Bishop Rosati, in sending the letters by error, sent Dugan's letter to Father Richard-Bole and Richard-Bole's letter to Dugan.

We have a great demand to make to Your Lordship: if it happens that complaints are sent against our administration, would you be kind enough to convey to us the knowledge of them? It would be painful for us to see our administration disowned and condemned without a chance to defend ourselves. You may rest assured that we shall tell Your Lordship in all sincerity the truth on every topic. We do not pretend to believe that all we do is correct, but we can assure you that our intentions are straight and upright.

In another letter of January 29, 1840, Father Richard-Bole writes:

Concerning Little Rock I wish to say that it is important to establish a school there. I do not know how to go about it, but to leave Little Rock without a school, means a great loss to our religion.

With Mr. Dugan I cannot settle. I cannot tell you what he wants; he does not know it himself, I believe. The land which Mr. Donnelly bought from Mr. Dugan at Little Rock has apparently no value (*vaut rien*). If we do not want to abandon everything to him, we have to bring him into court. This affair has caused me a great deal of trouble.

I intend to go to Little Rock next week. If I can settle with Mr. Dugan, I shall sell the land or take the money which he has received and commence to build a church elsewhere. . . . I have good prospects for help. I shall build the church of brick. Have the kindness to give me all the information about the laying of the cornerstone. You know that here everybody is Protestant—there are some Catholics, but in the case of a great number of them, I would wish they were Protestants.²⁷

I passed the last week at Little Rock. I sold the two lots which Mr. Donnelly had bought. I could not sell them, however, for what they cost, except by waiting for the money more than a year. I have bought twelve lots of ground which form an entire block, on an elevation which dominates the whole city. In this vicinity building is going on now; they say that a thousand houses will be built there. The lots cost 200 dollars each, payable within five years. I shall have another five years to pay, but after the first five I would have to pay 10 per cent interest on the principal; the interest does not accumulate. I took twelve lots to have room for an establishment if it be possible to have one later on, as also to be able to sell part, if I could not meet my obligation.

I have also furnished a plan for a church, 55 by 35; but 15 ft. will be taken off for a sacristy and a living room for the priest. If I stay here, I hope to raise enough money for the foundation and for the brick. I do not intend to go further at present; we shall see what can be done later on. We expect Mr. Timon, and we shall make use of his presence for the blessing of the foundation, for I shall not dare to undertake a solemn blessing alone. I am expecting Mr. Timon or your instructions on this

²⁷ Letter of Richard-Bole of February 15, 1840.

point. If anything is to be accomplished at Little Rock, there must be a resident priest here. One for the Post, one for St. Mary's; both shall have several stations and more work than they can do. How I would wish to see you for a few moments about these missions, to get your advice and your instructions, if it were possible to get some subscriptions at St. Louis for Little Rock!

After Mr. Dugan had covered me with his reproaches, he threw himself at my feet. As far as Little Rock is concerned, the affair with him is settled; regarding the house he built at Pine Bluff, Mr. Timon may settle that when he comes.²⁸

On April 21, 1840, Father Richard-Bole sent his last letter to the Bishop:

I shall leave St. Mary's for some weeks and take the next steamboat to Little Rock to labor there. The people have been very negligent, and we need the assistance of your prayers. I shall now start to build the church of which I wrote to you in my preceding letter.

I hear from Mr. Renaud that you are preparing to go to Rome. We shall pray daily that the Angel of the Lord may accompany you and lead you back safely like the son of Tobias. I shall not have the pleasure of receiving your benediction before you start, but I hope to have it when you return. You will visit the tombs of the Apostles. You know what this mission is; would Your Lordship ask for me for some of that apostolic spirit, needed to carry on the work of God? . . .²⁹

It seems, after Rosati was gone, Father Richard-Bole did not venture to erect a church at Little Rock. There was certainly not even the beginning of a church at the place, when Bishop Byrne, in 1844, arrived there. But the Loretine Sisters, in 1841, opened a school at Little Rock. The Superior of the four Sisters was Sister Alodia Vessels.

²⁸ Letter of March 14, 1840.

²⁹ There is considerable confusion in the St. Louis documents regarding the titulars of the various chapels and missions. According to a document, written by Saulnier c. 1850, the church below Pine Bluff, in 1839, was dedicated to the Blessed Virgin, the church at New Gascony to St. Irenaeus, the mission at Little Rock to St. Ambrose, at Napoleon to St. Lucy and at the Post to St. Dennis. The statistics of 1843 and 1844 call the mission of Little Rock St. Irenaeus, the church of the Post St. Ambrose. The Almanac (Directory) of 1838-1842, calls the church of Pine Bluff after St. Irenaeus, and in 1843 and 1844 the Almanacs give St. Mary as the titular of the church at New Gascony. It is certain, however, that the church at New Gascony up to the coming of Bishop Byrne was dedicated to St. Irenaeus, that of Pine Bluff to St. Mary, that of the Post before 1842, to St. Dennis, after 1842, to St. Ambrose. It was Father Richard-Bole who elected St. Irenaeus (not St. Ambrose) patron of the Little Rock Mission. The chapel built a. 1845, was dedicated to the Annunciation of Mary, the later cathedral to St. Andrew.

When it became known that a diocese had been erected with the episcopal See at Little Rock, and that a perfect stranger, Rev. Andrew Byrne, of St. Andrew's Church, New York, was to be its first bishop, Father Richard-Bole left Arkansas, to return to St. Louis.³⁰ The Loretine Sisters, by poverty, were compelled to give up their schools, both at the Post and at Little Rock (the academy at Pine Bluff had been closed in 1842), and to return to Ste. Genevieve and to Kentucky. The old French and Creole regime was buried for ever. All the St. Louis priests had withdrawn, but, in 1845, Bishop Byrne, with the Irish Fathers John Corry, Peter Walsh, P. Canavan, John Monaghan, Thomas McKeone and others, ushered in a new era.

Rev. F. G. HOLWECK,
St. Louis, Mo.

³⁰ He went to Louisiana later, and on his way to France was lost at sea, a. 1847.

THE MOST REVEREND JOHN BAPTIST PURCELL, D.D., ARCHBISHOP OF CINCINNATI

(1800-1883)

A writer of the Church history of the United States during the nineteenth century must become intimately acquainted with the life and labors of Archbishop Purcell, the Patriarch of the West and the creator of the great Archdiocese of Cincinnati, if he would present to posterity a full account of the founding of the Church in our country and reveal the fascinating story of the American Hierarchy.

Born with the century in February, 1800, at Mallow, Ireland, John Baptist Purcell early felt the call to the ministry of God's altar, and, like Samuel of old, cried, "Lord, here am I." At the age of eighteen he realized that he could not fulfil his heart's desire in his native land on account of English laws preventing higher education for Catholics; therefore, a century ago he bade adieu to home and friends, crossed the ocean and reached Baltimore in the spring of 1818.¹ With a certificate from Asbury College, Baltimore, he obtained a position as tutor in the family of Doctor Wilson on the eastern shore of Maryland. He remained there about two years until he was invited to Emmitsburg by the Rev. John Dubois, President of Mt. St. Mary's College, to become pupil and professor. Events proved that Father Dubois was inspired when he sent forth a call for the young John Baptist to place his name on Mt. St. Mary's scroll.²

He could sit with ease in the company of brilliant students and professors gathered at the old Mountain College, and it was not long until his personal charm, rare mental endowments and

¹ Archives Mount St. Mary's of the West, Bishop Purcell's *Journal*; Archives Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio, Marianne Reilly's *Journal*; Archives Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio, *Community Records*.

² "Asbury College (Methodist) was established in Baltimore in 1816, and named in honor of Bishop Asbury, fifty years a preacher, who died that year. Its first President was Rev. Samuel K. Jennings. It was located at the corner of Park Avenue and Franklin Streets, was chartered February 10, 1818, for the benefit of youth of every religious denomination with literary honors according to merit. It conferred degrees in 1818." *Letter of John Parker, Librarian of Peabody Institute, Baltimore, November 26, 1917. Circular of Information, No. 2, 1894. Bureau of Education. History of Education in Maryland.* Herbert B. Adams, pp. 247-254.

attractive qualities of heart, together with his burning zeal and vigorous faith, marked him as a leader of men.

He received tonsure and minor orders from Archbishop Maréchal on May 4, 1823, and on March 1, 1824, accompanied the Reverend Doctor Bruté to the Seminary of St. Sulpice in Paris, where he continued his course in theology.³ He was raised to the priesthood by the Archbishop of Paris, the Most Reverend Hyacinthe Louis de Quelen, in the historic church of Notre Dame, on May 21, 1826.⁴ After his ordination he remained in Paris for eighteen months longer, pursuing the higher courses in philosophy and theology. He returned to the United States in 1827, accompanied by the Reverend Samuel Eccleston, the future fifth Archbishop of Baltimore.⁵ Father John Baptist Purcell found his American Alma Mater steadily growing into the hearts and minds of its students, the future great men in Church and State. He gave to his work there the fulness of his powers, and in two years was elected to the Presidency. This appointment was contemporaneous with the First Provincial Council of the Church in the United States.⁶ The following year, 1830, through the efforts of its President, Mt. St. Mary's College was incorporated by the Legislature of Maryland.⁷

The then far-off Western city of Cincinnati lost its first bishop, the Right Rev. Edward Dominic Fenwick, O.P., on September 26, 1832,⁸ and Father John Baptist Purcell was chosen to succeed him. A letter from Bishop England to the Reverend James Ignatius Mullan, editor of the *Catholic Telegraph*, announced the news to his episcopal city. In this letter Bishop England asked Father Mullan to urge Father Purcell to accept the appointment,

³ McSWEENEY, *The Story of the Mountain*, Vol. i, p. 115.

⁴ Archives Cincinnati Archdiocese.

⁵ *Centennial History of Baltimore Cathedral*. Archives Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio.

⁶ Archives Cincinnati Archdiocese. *Centennial History of the Baltimore Cathedral*. *Truth Teller*, Vol. v, pp. 343, 350. *The Metropolitan*, Baltimore, 1830, p. 34. SHEA, *op. cit.*, Vol. iii, pp. 408-419. HAMMER, *Der Apostel von Ohio*, pp. 52-92.

⁷ McSWEENEY, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, p. 232. Archives Mount St. Mary's of the West, Archives Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio. *Letters*. Cf. *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. x, p. 603.

⁸ Archives Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio. *Journals*. Cf. *Catholic Telegraph*. Letter of Eliza Rose Powell, Vol. i, p. 406. Cf. *The Truth Teller*, Vol. viii, p. 340. HAMMER, *Der Apostel von Ohio*, p. 142.

stating that he knew efforts would be made to have him resign and retain his charge at Emmitsburg. The Bishop stated that there had been a "series of delays," and tradition asserts that the Cardinals, hesitating in their choice between Father John Purcell and Father John Hughes, asked Bishop England for a helpful suggestion. The Bishop could think of nothing to sway the Cardinals unless the fact that Father John Hughes was a self-made man might make him more acceptable than Father Purcell, a college president.⁹

The Cardinals in good faith conveyed to the Sacred College the message that Bishop England thought "a self-made man like Father John Purcell would be more agreeable to the people of the West" and told the Bishop later that their Eminences were highly gratified and had sent the document to the Holy Father for his signature. The Apostolic Brief reached the Archbishop of Baltimore in August, and Father Arthur Wainwright took it to Father Purcell at Emmitsburg. Doctor Bruté was opening a retreat for the students of the Seminary, and Father Purcell joined them in the holy exercises. He spent the month of September in settling his affairs at the College, and early in October sought the hospitable roof of Fathers Matthew Lekeu, S.J., and Paul Kohlmann, S.J., in Conewago, Adams Co., Pa. (now Edgegrove, in the Diocese of Harrisburg). Father John Francis Hickey, S.S., went there to assist him, and remained with him until the day of consecration.¹⁰ This took place on Sunday, October 13, 1833, in the Baltimore Cathedral. The consecrator was the Most Reverend James Whitfield, D.D., Bishops Dubois and Kenrick assisting him. The sermon for the occasion was preached by Reverend Samuel Eccleston, S.S., and Bishop Frederick Rese, of Detroit, Mich., was present in the sanctuary. The following Sunday, October 20, the Second Provincial Council of Baltimore was opened, and lasted a week. Bishop Purcell attended all the sessions of the Council, and while in Baltimore was the guest of the brother of his successor, a half-century later, Archbishop William Henry Elder.¹¹ After the Council he has-

⁹Archives Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio. *Bishop England's Letter.*

¹⁰*Ibid.*

¹¹SHEA, *Hist. Cath. Church*, vol. iii, p. 432.

tened to pay his farewell visits to his mountain home and St. Joseph's Valley.

He sang Pontifical Mass and preached at the College on Sunday, November 3, and was entertained by the pupils of St. Joseph's Academy on Monday, November 4. On Thursday, he left Emmitsburg, paying for his journey out of two hundred dollars borrowed from Father Hickey, S.S. He traveled by stage from Frederick, Md., to Wheeling, W. Va., reaching the latter place on Sunday morning, November 10. Here he began the busy missionary life which was his spirit's meat and drink for many decades. He heard confessions, preached, said Mass, and by special request, preached again in the evening. On Monday afternoon he and his party, two Sisters of Charity, Miss Ann Marr and a little boy, William Ryan, left Wheeling in the steamboat *Emigrant*. They reached the public landing in Cincinnati at 10 a. m. Thursday, November 14.¹² He was escorted to the house of Mr. Santiago, on Sycamore Street, opposite the Cathedral, from which, dressed in pontificals, he was led by a procession of the clergy and laity to the main altar of the Cathedral. He knelt at the foot of the altar until Bishop David conducted him to his episcopal throne. Bishop Flaget of Bardstown then addressed him, recalling the episcopal consecration of his predecessor, whose body lay beneath the sanctuary. He congratulated the widowed Church of Cincinnati that her mourning garb might be laid aside and her children's voices be raised in notes of thanksgiving to God for the presence of a Father in the midst of them.¹³

Scarcely was the day of ceremony over when the eager young Bishop began a serious study of the charge committed to his keeping. The College and Seminary claimed his first care, and he took part in the great work of education by filling the office of President of the Athenaeum. In his first Pastoral, published shortly after his arrival, he showed his zeal for the furtherance of Christian education, urging the people to depend on their own exertions rather than upon European aid in building churches and schools. In it, too, he extolled the life and labors of his saintly predecessor,

¹² Archives Mount St. Mary's of the West, *Journal*. Archives Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio, *Journal*.

¹³ Archives Mount St. Mary's of the West. *Catholic Telegraph*, Vol. iii, p. 5.

Bishop Fenwick, who had died a martyr to duty in Canton, Ohio, a year previous, on September 26, 1832.¹⁴ His first Charity Sermon for the benefit of the Orphan Asylum led to the foundation of the St. Peter's Benevolent Association, which together with the St. Joseph Society, formed twenty years later, has provided for the homeless little ones of the Cincinnati Archdiocese from the time of its institution until the present day.¹⁵ A visitation of his extensive diocese was his next work. Bad roads, swollen creeks, lumbering stage-coaches, prejudiced people, few Catholics, sparsely settled districts, might have daunted a less heroic soul; but these obstacles did not even change the gladness of spirit with which he set forth and continued his journeys in the cause of truth. He found the work of the earlier missionaries and the Dominican Fathers, and blessed their footprints, encouraging to germination the seed they had sown, and nourishing to fructification the plants still showing life.¹⁶

He saw himself established in a State already noted for its private schools and colleges, and in his own city he found intellectual activity to which he gave generous and enthusiastic support. He was recognized by the literary people of his new home as one who could speak authoritatively on scientific, classical, or literary subjects, as well as on matters of doctrine. He used his gift of oratory to overcome prejudice, to keep in touch with the educational system around him, and to have the opportunity of removing ignorance of Catholic belief, he accepted membership in the College of Teachers.¹⁷ In a few years, after his arrival in Cincinnati, the tide of immigration turned to Ohio, and as his episcopal city had but one Catholic church, the Cathedral, he decided to build Holy Trinity Church, to be devoted to the use of the German-speaking Catholics. Cincinnati had then for its limits Northern Row, now Liberty Street; Eastern Row, now Broadway; Western Row, now Central Avenue, and the river frontage at the south. Beyond Western Row was a commanding eminence, the "Old Mound," the center of the plan of the Mound Builders who orig-

¹⁴ Archives Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio. *Catholic Telegraph*, Vol. iii, p. 11.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, Vol. iii, p. 55. Archives Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio.

¹⁶ Archives Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio. *SHEA, op. cit.*, p. 620.

¹⁷ Archives Mount St. Mary's of the West; Archives Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio.

inally and most artistically laid out Cincinnati. This spot the Bishop chose for the site of Holy Trinity Church, for he saw that the city must spread westwardly and occupy the beautiful natural parks between the river and the hills.¹⁸ The immigration which affected Cincinnati had a corresponding influence on hamlets, villages and towns. Everywhere was the activity of growth and the Bishop following up each natural development labored to place side by side with material progress opportunities for the mental, moral and spiritual upbuilding of his flock. Holy Trinity Church was blessed on October 5, 1834, the first German parish of the diocese, and the first west of the Alleghanies.¹⁹

Although so occupied at home with planning churches and schools, teaching and preaching, he heard and answered promptly the call of his brother Bishops, and there are records of his preaching and lecturing in the north, south, east and west.²⁰

As a member of the College of Teachers, he met Mr. Alexander Campbell, who, contrary to the laws of the College, attacked the Catholic Church. Bishop Purcell expressed his disapprobation of Mr. Campbell's language and the latter announced in the public forum that he would preach on the subject in the Baptist Church the following Monday. The Bishop, who attended, was invited to reply, which he did from the same pulpit the next evening, with the enthusiastic applause of the whole audience. Mr. Campbell demanded an oral controversy in systematic form with moderators and limited time. The Bishop declined, but Mr. Campbell insisted, and the Purcell-Campbell controversy took place in the Sycamore Street Meeting House, beginning Friday, January 13, 1837, and closing on Friday, January 20. Its sessions were from 9.30 a. m. until 12.30 and from 3 p. m. until 5 p. m. each day except Sunday. At the close of the debate the secular press announced that Alexander Campbell's defense "in nowise tortured Catholicism." Although the Bishop was averse to these debates he thought it necessary to answer such attacks, and many conversions were the result, among them Judge Burnet, former

¹⁸ Archives Cincinnati Archdiocese, *Catholic Almanac*, 1834; Howe, *Historical Collections*, Cincinnati, 1848, p. 9.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, Cf. *Catholic Telegraph*, Vol. iii, p. 349.

²⁰ *Catholic Telegraph*, Vol. iii, pp. 81, 246-363; *Ibid.*, Vol. iv, pp. 316-375.

Governor of California, author of *The Path which Led a Protestant Lawyer to the Catholic Church*.²¹

Priests' retreats followed by a synod of the clergy were held yearly, each occupying a week. Later, retreats for the laity followed for another week. Anniversary Orations, like the Charity Sermons, were the chief means of helping the Asylums. They served two purposes. Persons of marked ability and reputation were invited for the purpose, and the congregation had the advantage of listening to renowned speakers while performing their duty to the poor.²² Fairs were begun later, and a society called "The Mary and Martha Society" for the temporal and spiritual relief of the sick and indigent.²³ The needs of the diocese at this time, 1838, impelled the Bishop to visit Europe as "a beggar and a pilgrim" for the sake of his flock. The Leopoldine Association, founded through the earnest solicitations of a Cincinnati priest, Father Rese, had helped the Church in Ohio during Bishop Fenwick's time, but during the first three years of Bishop Purcell's administration nothing had been sent from Vienna.²⁴ In 1837, a gift of four thousand florins came, and the same amount in 1838. The Bishop left Cincinnati in May, 1838, and reached Liverpool in July. He visited his mother in Mallow, and received public honor in his native place. He was received in Belgium as an Apostle of the New World. Some Belgian clergy after listening to his words of burning zeal cried out, "We are nothing! We have seen John the Baptist. We have seen Paul the Apostle of Nations—the Apostle of the New World!"²⁵ During the winter he journeyed to Munich and Vienna, laid before the Leopoldine Association the needs of his struggling diocese and succeeded in arousing the interest of the Society. Very Reverend Hercules Brassac, who had recently and through the influence of Bishop Purcell opened the "Agence Ecclésiastique du Clergé Catholique des États Unis d'Amérique," accompanied him.²⁶ From Vienna the Bishop went to Rome

²¹ *Catholic Telegraph*, Vol. vi, p. 100; Archives Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio.

²² Archives Cincinnati Archdiocese; Archives Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio.

²³ *Catholic Telegraph*, Vol. vii, p. 38; Archives Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio.

²⁴ Archives Cincinnati Archdiocese, *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. iii, pp. 773-776. Cf. *Catholic Historical Review*, Vol. ii, pp. 51-53.

²⁵ *Dublin Register*, October 20, 1838.

²⁶ Archives Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio. Cf. Brassac Letters, in the *Catholic Historical Review*, Vol. iii, pp. 392-416.

where he spent much time and had frequent audiences with Gregory XVI.²⁷ Writing from the Sulpician Seminary of St. Irenaeus at Lyons, May 2, 1839, he says:

When asked if the divine service begins to be performed *with a certain solemnity* chez nous, my answer to such questions is something of a swell, and a "Ça Commence" gives the enquirer a hint that we have a little pride mixed with other bad qualities and defects which makes us resent with proper dignity such insinuations. However, I should be very wrong to take offense at anything that is said by our Catholic brethren in Europe concerning our Church in the United States. They all take the most sincere interest in our welfare, they are generous in their contributions, fervent in their prayers, sanguine in their hopes for the American Church. When kings have, in some measure, ceased to endow the Church, the poor have taken it under their munificent protection and bid fair to afford it more effectual support—without stifling, or squeezing it almost to death, as kings have done but too often, in their embrace. I cannot describe to you all the joy which this admirable association of the poor to sustain the foreign missions affords the common Father of the faithful. His heart is truly like that of his divine Master, the Heavenly Shepherd and Great Bishop of our souls. He received me with the most cordial and paternal affection, took me in his venerable arms, made me sit by his side, kept my hand in his and said to me such kind and encouraging words as I should not dare allow myself to repeat. The repeated benedictions which he gave to all who are so justly dear to our Lord in Cincinnati inspire the hope that you . . . will be ever happy, good, and fervent, that earthly happiness, as I pray God, may be to you a pledge of everlasting bliss. . . . I reserve for conversation anecdotes of the courts and kings that I have visited in Europe. These visits have convinced me more than ever that there is nothing great or grand, or amiable, or bright, but Heaven—and that kings can deserve it as well as beggars. The month of April was a terribly capricious one in the south of Europe—and it was no pleasant affair to be there with sharp and freezing Northeasters in Florence, Marseilles and Lyons at a time of the year when we think at home that there is nothing but sunshine and flowers in these reputed happier climes. I am an invalid here in the Seminary of St. Sulpice at Lyons with sore throat and sore bones after my journey through the "Eden of the World." Alas! there was something to regret in that other! I am not quite sure whether I can be at home for the 1th of August, although with the divine blessing it is probable. Will you . . . have as many rooms as possible prepared for our expected visitors at my return? It is likely that I shall be accompanied by at least six priests, perhaps by ten. . . .

I offered up the Holy Sacrifice in the Cathedral dedicated to St. John Baptist, and Bishop Flaget preached for the members of the Prop-

²⁷ *Ami de la Religion*, June 13, 1838, *Catholic Telegraph*, Vol. viii, p. 294.

agation of the Faith. There were 4,000 communions in the city today, and to 300 of the number I had the happiness to break the Bread of Life and Immortality. How much happier they than the young man who has shot himself in despair of correcting the bad habits of a gambler, or the four foolish virgins drowned yesterday morning by the swamping of a pleasure boat in the rapid Rhone! . . .

There is a purgatory, and mine consists in this life's interruptions. At home or abroad, it is nothing but tap, tap, tap at my door. I try to resign myself to it as one of the ways to get to Heaven—but it makes me leave undone many things which I should do to reach that bright abode. Yesterday I visited the Hospital General. There are in it 1,100 sick, attended by 160 Sisters, who wear a religious habit, a large silver cross, give edification, but belong to no religious order, obey no particular superior, but the Administration of the Hospital. There are 40 lay-brothers also in the Hospital. Oh, what a discount on the joys of life is that large mass of human misery!—O God! what is man that thou art mindful of him! . . . A circumstance occurred at a dying bedside which greatly consoled me. I'll tell it you, please God, in Cincinnati.²⁹

As a result of his earnest appeals during his journey through Europe and the influence of Father Brassac, the Bishop returned to Cincinnati with several clergymen. They sailed from Havre on July 8, in the ship *Silvie de Grasse* and arrived in New York on August 22, 1839. His formal welcome home occurred on September 19. In a reply to an address of the St. Peter's Benevolent Society, he told his people:

That his absence from them for so long a time was occasioned by their spiritual and temporal necessities, and that to relieve them he had despised shame and knocked with the pilgrim and beggar at the gate of the rich and the cottage door of the poor in Europe.³⁰

The Catholics of Ohio and Kentucky learned at this time that the *Catholic Telegraph*, because financial support was wanting, must discontinue its publication. They held a mass meeting, and devised not only means for its maintenance, but established likewise "The Roman Catholic Society for the Diffusion of Knowledge." This Society attracted attention in other large cities, and Rev. Dr. J. White wrote Bishop Purcell that they were following his example and establishing a similar association at Calvert Hall, Baltimore.³¹

²⁹ Archives Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio.

³⁰ Archives Cincinnati Archdiocese; cf. *Catholic Telegraph*, Vol. viii, p. 351.

³¹ *Catholic Telegraph*, Vol. viii, pp. 380-382.

The year 1840, being the fiftieth anniversary of the consecration of Right Reverend John Carroll, first Bishop of Baltimore and of the whole United States, was a year of Jubilee and the Fourth Provincial Council was opened on May 16, in the Baltimore Cathedral.²¹ It was the largest ever assembled in the new world, the number of Bishops being thirteen. Archbishop Eccleston and his eleven suffragans had invited Bishop Forbin-Janson of Nancy and Toul and Primate of Lorraine, France, to attend the meeting. This illustrious prelate of noble family had a great desire for missionary life and Pope Gregory XVI, at the request of Bishop Purcell, had sanctioned his coming to the United States. The decrees of the Council, eleven in number, were confirmed by the Pope on November 22.

At the Third Provincial Council held in April, 1837, the bishops had asked that sees be created at Pittsburgh, Nashville, Natchez and Dubuque.

In 1840, the Sisters of Notre Dame of Namur arrived in Cincinnati and the Jesuit Fathers of the Missouri Province opened a college in the Athenaeum.²² The Seminary was moved to the Lytle Farm in Brown County. It was under the direction of the Vincentian Fathers for several years, but as the Bishop desired personal supervision of his ecclesiastical students, the Seminary was restored to its old place and the Jesuit Fathers conducted it for a short time until the Bishop's dream of a Mount St. Mary's of the West began to be a reality.

The Cincinnati Cathedral described, in 1828, as "a neat and elegant building finished in the Gothic order," had become too small for its congregation and the Bishop purchased a site opposite the City Building for a new Cathedral. The corner-stone was laid on May 20, 1841.²³ At this time there were fifty-five churches in the diocese and others in prospect. The Redemptorist Fathers on account of discouraging experiences with the people of St. Alphonsus Church in northern Ohio had left the diocese in 1839, much to the regret of the Bishop.²⁴

²¹ *Catholic Telegraph*, Vol. ix, p. 150; SHEA, *op. cit.*, p. 452.

²² *American Catholic Historical Society Records*, Vol. xi, p. 325 *et seq.* Archives Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio; BRASSAC *Letters*.

²³ Archives Cincinnati Archdiocese, *Catholic Telegraph*, *op. cit.*, pp. 181-183.

²⁴ Archives Cincinnati Archdiocese; SHEA, *op. cit.*, Vol. iii, pp. 31, 620-621.

The Dominican and Jesuit Fathers were assisting the secular clergy in all parts of the diocese and the progress of Catholicity was so apparent that the prejudice of Lyman Beecher found vent in his "Plea for the West," an argument against foreign immigration to the Mississippi Valley.³⁵ The Bishop not only saw the spread of religion through his diocese but he realized that Cincinnati proper was mounting the beautiful hills surrounding it and with his extraordinary foresight and good taste selected the most promising sites for churches and institutions. The cross-crowned hills of the Queen City of the West are a perpetual monument to his zeal for God's glory. Many bishops on their way to the Fifth Provincial Council of Baltimore, which opened on May 14, 1843, stopped in Cincinnati and congratulated Bishop Purcell on the progress of religion in Ohio. Sixteen bishops attended the Council, which opened with very imposing ceremonies. Bishop Purcell occupied the pulpit on the evenings of Monday and Friday, and on the following Sunday at High Mass. He delivered a discourse in Calvert Hall on Monday, gave Confirmation on Ascension Thursday, Minor Orders to some Jesuit novices in Frederick on Friday, Confirmation on Saturday in St. Joseph's Chapel "in the happy Valley of the Sisters of Charity," and on Sunday sang High Mass and administered Confirmation in the home of his early days, Mount St. Mary's, Emmitsburg.³⁶ He and Bishop Hughes sailed from Boston early in June and spent the summer in France. Bishop Purcell returned in the late fall enriched by many gifts for the institutions of his diocese. He left Havre on the ship *Vesta*.³⁷ He expected the Fathers of the Precious Blood to accompany him, but they sailed later and arrived at New Orleans on December 21, 1843.³⁸ They arrived in Cincinnati on New Year's Day, 1844, by way of the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers and were members of the second European community brought to the New World by Bishop Purcell. They took charge of the field of labor resigned by the Redemptorist Fathers who went to Pittsburgh. On St. Joseph's Day of this year, 1844, Bishop Purcell began his long list of Consecrations in St. Peter's

³⁵ VENABLE, *Literary Culture*, p. 379; *Catholic Telegraph*, Vol. xii, p. 86.

³⁶ *Catholic Telegraph*, *op. cit.*, p. 166-174.

³⁷ Archives Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio.

³⁸ *Ibid.*; SHEA, *op. cit.*, Vol. iv, p. 173.

Cathedral, Cincinnati. Bishop Henni was made Ordinary of Milwaukee and Bishop Reynolds of Charleston. Bishop Henni was Vicar-General and had founded, in 1837, the first German Catholic paper published in the United States—*Der Wahrheitsfreund*.³⁹ It continued its existence, a companion to the *Catholic Telegraph* for eighty years. The year 1845 was remarkable for the number of churches begun or blessed and for the advent of the Ursuline Sisters from France, with Mother Julia Chatfield as Superior. They took possession of the old Seminary, the Lytle Farm, in Brown County and opened their Academy of St. Martin.⁴⁰ On September 29, the Bishop issued a pastoral letter, informing his flock that the Cathedral would be consecrated on All Saints Day. For eight days previous to the ceremony the clergy were engaged in the exercises of a spiritual retreat. On the day of consecration the English-speaking Catholics of Cincinnati received Holy Communion in the old Cathedral to prepare their souls for a joyous and worthy entrance into their new and magnificent church. Archbishop Eccleston of Baltimore was the consecrating prelate and the ample sanctuary was filled with bishops and priests who came to rejoice with Bishop Purcell, who saw "the places of his Tents enlarged and their cords lengthened on every side."⁴¹ Then it occurred to him that another See in the northern part of Ohio would be an advantage to religion and this thought he revealed to Archbishop Eccleston and placed before the Fathers of the Sixth Plenary Council of Baltimore in May, 1846. The Holy See created the Diocese of Cleveland, making the line of division 40° 41', but this proved unsatisfactory and county limits were adopted.⁴²

The years 1847 and 1848 were noted for the many churches erected in Ohio and for the visitation of all of them by the zealous Bishop.⁴³ After the solemn removal of Bishop Fenwick's body from St. Xavier Church to the Cathedral, the Bishop began the arduous task of visiting every church in his diocese. In Gallipolis, where the French, in 1790, had established a Prefecture-Apostolic to include southern Ohio, the Bishop had the happiness

³⁹ Archives Cincinnati Archdiocese.

⁴⁰ SHEA, *op. cit.*, Vol. iv, p. 177.

⁴¹ *Catholic Telegraph*, Vol. xiv, p. 319.

⁴² Archives Cincinnati Archdiocese.

⁴³ Archives Cincinnati Archdiocese; *United States Catholic Magazine*, Vol. viii, p. 10.

of bringing back to the Church a granddaughter of Mr. Vincent, M.C., one of the colonists who came with Dom Didier, Benedictine Procurator of the Abbey of St. Denis near Paris. Dom Didier built a church at Gallipolis, and labored for a few years among his disheartened people who, finding themselves deceived by wealthy speculators of France, abandoned the dream of a rich colony in the Scioto valley and returned to their own homes. Their pastor went to St. Louis and engaged in parochial work.⁴⁶

The Bishop's letters are filled with graphic descriptions of his travels, but the most noticeable features are the cheerfulness of a missionary and the zeal of an apostle.

In 1848, the Father General of the Jesuits in Rome sent through Very Reverend Father Van de Velde, S.J., a document declaring "Bishop Purcell Founder of the St. Xavier College." By the terms of the paper the Bishop became a participant in all the prayers, good works and suffrages of all the members of the Society of Jesus *in perpetuum*, during life and after death.⁴⁷

On July 19, Feast of St. Vincent de Paul, the Bishop laid the corner-stone of Mount St. Mary's of the West, his Theological Seminary.⁴⁸ The Seventh Provincial Council of Baltimore opened on May 6, and closed on May 13, the following Sunday.⁴⁷ Two Archbishops and twenty-three Bishops attended. Archbishop Kenrick made the opening address, Bishop Purcell preached at the requiem for deceased prelates, and Bishop Hughes closed the Council. It was to this Council that His Holiness, Pope Pius IX, had been invited. On account of conditions in Italy it was believed the Holy Father might go into France and the American Hierarchy hoped to have the privilege of receiving him in Baltimore. His answer was, "Nothing could be more grateful to my heart than to enjoy the presence and conversation of the Fathers of the Council but existing times and circumstances make it impossible."⁴⁸

⁴⁶ SHEA, *op. cit.*, Vol. iii, pp. 333-334; Cf. CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW, Vol. ii, pp. 195-204 (*A Vanished Bishopric*); The story of Scioto has been charmingly told by Father Lawrence Kenny, S. J., in the CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW, Vol. iv, pp. 415-451.

⁴⁷ Archives Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio. *Letters*.

⁴⁸ ALZOG (Pabisch and Byrne), *History of the Church*, Vol. iii, p. 786; *Catholic Telegraph*, Vol. xviii, pp. 106, 114-115.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 152.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

In this Seventh Council, the erection of Cincinnati into a Metropolitan See, with Louisville, Detroit, Vincennes and Cleveland as suffragans, was petitioned.⁴⁹ Bishop Purcell returned from the Council to find his diocese visited by a scourge of cholera as disastrous as that of 1832. He wrote a touching pastoral to his people warning them of the danger and urging them to prepare for death, which might come suddenly. This step would aid the priests, likewise, in their exhausting and constant duties during the epidemic.

Even in this time of distress, when priests and sisters were stricken and the Asylums were being filled with orphans, he did not forget the wants of the Holy Father, but sent \$1,000 as Peter's Pence. He dedicated two churches and towards the close of the year 1849, he formed The Young Men's Catholic Association.⁵⁰

The Dean of the American Hierarchy, the Right Reverend Benedict Joseph Flaget, died on January 11, 1850. Bishop Purcell preached his funeral oration, and Father Badin, the protopriest of the American Church, performed the last absolution.⁵¹

A recommendation for taxing churches was introduced into the State Convention, and drew from the Bishop a strong protest. To his own people he said: "Our Catholic forefathers believed, and we believe, that the House of God ought to be the noblest House in every city and town." Non-Catholics joined the Catholics in preventing the obnoxious levy.⁵² The Bishop continued selecting sites for new churches. St. Patrick's, St. Francis de Sales, St. Paul's and St. Boniface, Cummins ville, were soon in course of erection. This year, 1850, the golden year of his life, was celebrated by a reception of all the children attending the Catholic Free Schools.⁵³ On August 6, Cardinal Fransoni announced the forwarding of Bulls making Cincinnati a Metropolitan See, with Louisville, Detroit, Vincennes and Cleveland as suffragans. Bishop Purcell received the Apostolic Brief on October 8.⁵⁴ It

⁴⁹ Archives Cincinnati Archdiocese; Archives Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

⁵¹ WEBB, *Centenary of Catholicity in Kentucky*, pp. 374-402. Louisville, 1882.

⁵² *Catholic Telegraph*, June 8, 1850.

⁵³ *Catholic Telegraph*, June 8, 1850.

⁵⁴ *Concilia Provincialia Baltimore habita, 1929-1849*, Baltimore, 1851. Archives Cincinnati Archdiocese; *Catholic Telegraph*, October 12, 1850. *Ibid.*, October 26, 1850.

was in the same consistory in which Pope Pius IX proclaimed Bishop Wiseman Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, thus restoring the Catholic Hierarchy to England, that the Pope was asked to send the pallium to the Archbishops, John B. Purcell of Cincinnati, Antoine Blanc of New Orleans and John Hughes of New York. This was the fourth time an Archbishop had been created in the United States: Baltimore in 1810, Oregon Territory in 1846, St. Louis in 1847, and in 1850, Cincinnati, New York, and New Orleans. The Right Reverend John B. Lamy was consecrated in the Cincinnati Cathedral on November 24, 1850.⁵⁵

May 21, 1851, was the Silver Jubilee of Archbishop Purcell's ordination. He spent it in Europe, whither he had gone to receive the pallium at the hands of Pope Pius IX. Before giving him the emblem of his archiepiscopal power, the Holy Father in recognition of his services made him assistant at the papal throne.⁵⁶ The Archbishop returned to Cincinnati in August and found a very important subject awaiting his decision. The affiliation of the Sisters at Emmitsburg to the Daughters of Charity in France was being accomplished through the instrumentality of Father Deluol, a Sulpician. A full account of the transaction may be found in *The History of Mother Seton's Daughters*.⁵⁷

The little colony established in Cincinnati in 1829, had conducted schools and orphanage there, and clung tenaciously to Mother Seton's plans, dress, ideals. A notification of the impending change caused the Sisters to seek the advice of the Archbishop and to express their opposition to the movement. After serious deliberation he announced that it was God's will for them to remain Mother Seton's Daughters and that he would open a novitiate and be their Father and Ecclesiastical Superior.⁵⁸ His last hour, July 4, 1883, found him filling both offices.

The community was incorporated as The Sisters of Charity of Cincinnati, Ohio, and the Academy was chartered according to the laws of Ohio.⁵⁹

⁵⁵ Archives Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio.

⁵⁶ *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. xxii, pp. 570-572.

⁵⁷ McCANN, *History of Mother Seton's Daughters*, Vol. ii, pp. 98-118, New York, 1917.

⁵⁸ Archives Cincinnati Archdiocese.

⁵⁹ Archives Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio.

Through the little community which he took as his own, he saw many of his plans realized, and many of his hopes fulfilled. Hospitals and diocesan institutions were placed under their care, and are still conducted by them.

On April 19, 1853, the great missionary, Very Reverend Theodore Stephen Badin, who had been a member of the Cathedral household for three years, died, assisted by the prayers of Archbishop Purcell, the clergy of the Cathedral, and the Sisters of Charity. His body was placed beside Bishop Fenwick in the crypt of the Cincinnati Cathedral.⁴⁰

Father Baraga, an associate of Father Badin in early missionary life, and Father Carrell, S.J., were consecrated in Cincinnati on the Feast of All Saints. The Church was gaining in influence as well as members. The Catholic marriages of this year were twelve hundred and sixty-one and the baptisms three thousand seven hundred and fifty-five.⁴¹

In December, the Most Reverend Cajetan Bedini, Archbishop of Thebes and Nuncio to Brazil, paid a visit to Archbishop Purcell. Previous to his coming to Cincinnati he had presented himself to the administration at Washington but had not received all the courtesies due to him as a member of the diplomatic corps. Italian and German revolutionists had spread calumnies about him and secular papers printed them so that by the time he reached Cincinnati plots against his life had been formed. Archbishop Purcell's vigilance and influence prevented or quelled any serious uprising against him, although a mob marched to the cathedral residence with evil intentions.⁴²

The Feast of the Immaculate Conception, December 8, 1854, was one of special exultation. The Archbishop had issued a pastoral expressing his wish to unite his diocese with the faithful in Rome and throughout the whole Catholic world in proclaiming the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God.⁴³

The first Provincial Council of Cincinnati opened on May 13, 1855.⁴⁴ Letters had been sent to the Bishops of the Province, to

⁴⁰ Archives Cincinnati Archdiocese; SHEA, *op. cit.*, p. 537.

⁴¹ SHEA, *op. cit.*, Vol. iii, p. 634.

⁴² *Catholic Telegraph*, Vol. xviii, February 4, 1911.

⁴³ Archives Cincinnati Archdiocese.

⁴⁴ *Catholic Telegraph*, May 19, 26, 1855.

the Superiors of the Dominican, Jesuit, Franciscan, Precious Blood and Holy Cross Orders, stating the object of the Council, the subjects to be discussed and inviting their presence and help. The Council lasted one week and passed nineteen decrees, one of which was to make Mount St. Mary's of the West a Provincial Seminary for Holy Scripture, Theology, Church History, Patrology and the cognate branches of clerical learning, and St. Thomas in Kentucky, a Seminary for preparatory studies. A decree was passed, likewise, asking the Holy See to make Mount St. Mary's a Pontifical College and requesting the faculty of conferring degrees in Philosophy and Theology.⁶⁵

The Fathers of the Council urged the erection of Sees at Sault Sainte Marie and Fort Wayne, forbade the borrowing or receiving money on deposit without episcopal permission, encouraged the erection of parochial schools, hospitals and asylums, and recommended the establishment of definite support for infirm clergymen. The Council closed on May 20, with great dignity and ceremony.⁶⁶

Mrs. Sarah Peter, a convert, daughter of Governor Thomas Worthington of Ohio and sister of General Worthington, became at this time a valuable co-worker with Archbishop Purcell. Through her influence the Good Shepherd Sisters began work in Cincinnati in 1857, the Sisters of Mercy from Kinsale, Ireland, in 1858, and

⁶⁵ Archives Cincinnati Archdiocese, VI, "Cum innotuisset Patribus deesse in plerisque Seminariis Dioecesis tum copiam quae decet magistrorum, tum numerum alumnorum ad alendam aemulationem in studiis scientiae et pietatis necessarium, placuit omnibus Seminarium commune pro universa Provincia instituere, Seminariis Dioecesis tamen minime sublatis; aeternaeque Seminarii Sanctae Mariae ad Montem prope urbem Cincinnati sem, munificentissime a Reverendissimo ac Illustrissimo DD. Archiepiscopo Cincinnati oblata, eligere in situm novi instituti." VII. "Perpensis quoque incrementis, quae exinde sacrarum rerum scientia, atque decore quem Catholica Religio in his regionibus caperet, censuerunt omnes supplicandam esse Sanctam Sedem ut ex sua dignatione hoc Seminarium Provinciale aliquo modo Collegium Pontificium fieret, quatenus per auctoritatem Apostolicam facultatem conferendi gradus Philosophiae et Theologiae, atque exigendi ab alumnis, post sex mensium probationem juramentum manendi in propria Missione in ejusmodi Collegiis consuetum, decoraretur." The sacred Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith, through its Prefect, Cardinal Barnabo, rendered the following decision regarding the seventh decree: "Differi voluerunt responsum quoad petitionem ut Provinciale Seminarium declaretur Pontificium, eidemque conferatur tradendi gradus academicos."

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*

the Sisters of St. Francis from Cologne. In 1868, nine years before her death, she brought the Little Sisters of the Poor.⁶⁷

On April 26, Archbishop Purcell consecrated the Right Reverend James F. Wood for Philadelphia, and the Right Reverend H. D. Juncker for Alton. The beautiful Gothic Chapel of Mount St. Mary's of the West was consecrated on June 24, 1857. Towards the close of the year, the Archbishop was appealed to in the controversy which arose in the Congregation of the Holy Redeemer and which led to the foundation of the Paulist Congregation.⁶⁸

At the end of the year 1857, the Catholic population of the Cincinnati Diocese was estimated at two hundred and seventy-seven thousand six hundred and eighty. The year 1858 was marked by two important events, the consecration of the Right Reverend J. H. Luers as first Bishop of Fort Wayne on January 10, and the meeting of the Second Provincial Council of Cincinnati on May 2. The decrees of the First Provincial Council of Cincinnati and those of Baltimore were renewed and twelve others adopted.⁶⁹

The Feast of St. Edward of England, October 13, 1858, was the Silver Jubilee of Archbishop Purcell's episcopate. The whole Archdiocese united in showing its great Metropolitan the appreciation of his works and sacrifices in accomplishing them. Bulls arrived appointing Very Reverend Edward Purcell, Coadjutor to the Bishop of Pittsburgh, but he declined the honor.⁷⁰

The Catholic Institute was organized early in the year 1859.⁷¹ The Society issued stock, which sold very rapidly, and a hall in the Roman style of architecture was built in which Catholic Societies could hold their deliberations, hear lectures, or transact business. Chief Justice Taney had been invited to lay the

⁶⁷ *Catholic Telegraph*, May 12, 1855; Archives Cincinnati Archdiocese; SHEA, *op. cit.*, Vol. iv, pp. 544-545.

⁶⁸ Archives Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio.

⁶⁹ Archives Cincinnati Archdiocese, *Concilium Cincinnatiense II, habitum anno 1858*. Cincinnati, Pastoral Letter, May, 1858, *Catholic Telegraph*, May 8-15, 1858; McCORMICK, Rev. P. J., Ph.D., *History of Education, The Catholic Education Press*, Washington, D. C., 1915.

⁷⁰ Anniversary Address of the Priests and People of the Diocese of Cincinnati, presented at the Silver Jubilee, 1858.

⁷¹ *History and Organization of the Catholic Institute*, Cincinnati, 1860.

corner-stone of the edifice, but the letter miscarried and reached the venerable gentleman only the day before the ceremony.

At this time the baptism registrations for the year were almost nine thousand, marriages about two thousand, and deaths nearly twenty-seven hundred. The increase, together with immigration, required the building and enlarging of churches in all parts of the diocese and the Archbishop encouraged the people by his own zeal and activity.

He extended a helping hand likewise to his brother bishops, as in the case of Bishop Bayley of Newark, N. J. Bishop Bayley, wishing to have Mother Seton's Daughters in his diocese, applied to New York and Cincinnati in vain, for neither community felt able to establish a mission in his See. Correspondence with Archbishop Purcell and Mother Margaret resulted in the sending of the Newark postulants for training in the Cincinnati Novitiate.⁷² The five young ladies returned to New Jersey at the end of September, 1859, when the Daughters of Mother Seton began their remarkable career in Bishop Bayley's diocese. The corner-stone of the Immaculata on Mt. Adams was laid this year. The Honorable John Quincy Adams was invited by the Astronomical Society of Cincinnati, in 1843, to lay the corner-stone of the Observatory on Mt. Ida, changed then to Mt. Adams. On account of bigoted remarks made by the "Old Man Eloquent," Bishop Purcell resolved to have a church spire point to the clouds from the hill near the Observatory. The Immaculata fulfilled his vow, and later he had the satisfaction of seeing the Observatory itself, the Passionist Monastery, and the Holy Cross Church on neighboring sites.⁷³

On September 11, he addressed an audience of eight thousand people on Bunker Hill, Boston, when the corner-stone of St. Francis de Sales Church was laid on this historic ground. On his return home he learned that the President of his Seminary, Right Reverend John Quinlan, had been appointed Bishop of Mobile.⁷⁴

At the opening of the Civil War, Archbishop Purcell announced to his people: "The President has spoken and it is our duty to obey him as head of the nation. Moreover, Ohio, the State in

⁷² Archives Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio. *Letters*.

⁷³ Archives Cincinnati Archdiocese, *Catholic Telegraph*, August 27, 1859.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, September 24, 1859. Archives Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio.

which we are, has also spoken on the subject. It is then our solemn duty as good and loyal citizens to walk shoulder to shoulder with all our fellow-citizens in support of the national honor."⁷⁵

In the Third Provincial Council of Cincinnati, which began its session on Sunday, April 27, 1861, the Archbishop in his opening speech called attention to the sad spectacle never before witnessed in our glorious republic and prayed God that hostilities might cease and wiser and better counsels prevail.⁷⁶ At the beginning of the war he was very cautious in his political views, but after studying the question he became an earnest supporter of the United States Government, although he knew that many of his people adhered to the party in the North against the war. He gave willingly some of his professors from the Seminary at the call for troops, and blessed the Army Chaplains and Sisters whose summons came almost simultaneously with the cry—to arms!

Feeling the weight of cares and responsibilities, the Archbishop asked the Holy See for an Auxiliary.⁷⁷ Right Reverend Sylvester H. Rosecrans was consecrated Bishop of Pompeiopolis on March 25, 1862, in the Cathedral of Cincinnati, and at once assumed the care of the diocese, as the Archbishop accepted the Pope's invitation to go to Rome for the canonization of the Japanese Martyrs. This was his second trip within a year. At his decennial visit the preceding year, the Holy Father had made him a member of the Noble Society of Rome, and created his mother the Countess Joanna. The Reverend Doctor Francis Joseph Pabisch, who came to Cincinnati with the Archbishop in 1862, succeeded to the Presidency of Mount St. Mary's of the West on the death of the Very Reverend William J. Barry, April 20, 1863.

On the vigil of Pentecost the Archbishop published a Pastoral Letter explaining the scope of his proposed Normal School and asked the cooperation of clergy and people.⁷⁸

The summer of 1865 deprived the archdiocese of two remarkable clergymen, the Reverend Donald Xavier MacLeod, a writer of note and distinguished convert, and the Very Reverend

⁷⁵ *Catholic Telegraph*, April 20, 1861.

⁷⁶ Archives Cincinnati Archdiocese.

⁷⁷ KELLY and KIRWIN, *History of St. Mary's Seminary*, pp. 234-240. Cincinnati, 1894.

⁷⁸ *Catholic Telegraph*, June 22, 1861, December 16, 1863.

Edward T. Collins, V.G., a man of rare literary taste, a model citizen and zealous priest.⁷⁹

Bishop Lamy, of Santa Fe, N. Mex., a pioneer missionary of Ohio, wrote to Archbishop Purcell at this time, to ask help for his far-off needy diocese. The answer to his appeal was that a band of Sisters of Charity in a few weeks began their first journey to the Indian hunting ground. Arrived at the "City of Holy Faith" they took up their abode in the Bishop's adobe palace, which was used as Seminary and orphanage.⁸⁰

All during the Civil War the activities of the diocese were remarkable, but at the close of hostilities churches were built in many places, schools opened, and academies were filled with pupils from the South. Mount St. Mary's of the West was in a flourishing condition, and the Colleges conducted by the Jesuit, Holy Cross, and Franciscan, Fathers in Cincinnati, and by the Brothers of Mary in Dayton, as well as the Novitiates of the Dominicans and of the Precious Blood Fathers and the charitable institutions, were all showing the vigor of Catholicity in southern Ohio. Statistics obtained for the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore placed on record the See of Cincinnati with an Archbishop, an auxiliary Bishop, one hundred and fifty priests, one hundred and eighty-one churches, and a proportionate number of parochial schools.⁸¹

The Council met on October 7, 1866, and was presided over by Most Reverend Martin John Spalding, Apostolic Delegate. Six other Archbishops and thirty-nine Bishops were present.⁸² The question of establishing a Catholic University like that of Dublin was discussed, also the manner of reaching the colored people made free by the late war. The eloquent sermons of Archbishops Purcell, Spalding, McCloskey, and Kenrick, and those of several of the Bishops were printed in this country and reprinted in Europe. President Johnson attended the closing session of the Council.⁸³

⁷⁹ Archives Cincinnati Archdiocese. KELLY and KIRWIN, *op. cit.*, p. 213; *Catholic Telegraph*, June, August, 1865.

⁸⁰ Archives Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio.

⁸¹ SHEA, *op. cit.*, Vol. iv, pp. 715-720. BROTHER JOHN E. GARVIN, S.M., *The Centenary of the Society of Mary*, Dayton, Ohio, 1917.

⁸² *Ibid.*

⁸³ *Ibid.*

The anniversary of St. Peter's martyrdom was celebrated in Rome, in June, 1867. The Archbishop journeyed to the Eternal City for the memorable occasion, and was received with especial honor by Pope Pius IX, who told his Master of Ceremonies to place him immediately at his right hand at the throne when he said Mass in St. Peter's on the great feast.⁸⁴

On his return from Rome he found it necessary to add a wing to his Seminary, and to build a church nearby for the Catholics of Price Hill.

Columbus, Ohio, was made a See, with Bishop Rosecrans as its first Ordinary, so that the Archbishop's original diocese was now divided into several parts, each governed by one of his own spiritual sons consecrated by him.⁸⁵

The Church in the West had not only struck its roots firmly into the ground but had also sent forth enlivening shoots to other sections of the country, and it was the hand of Archbishop Purcell which had moulded her destiny and his foresightedness that had directed her movements.

In his seventieth year, still fresh and active and with unabated zeal, he sent forth a Pastoral asking for the prayers of his people to direct the great Council of the Church to which all the Bishops of the Catholic World had been invited by the Sovereign Pontiff, Pope Pius IX.⁸⁶

A Jubilee for this purpose began June 2, to continue until the close of the Council. The Archbishop left Cincinnati on October 14, to attend the Ecumenical Council of the Vatican, which began on December 8, 1869, and adjourned on July 18, 1870.⁸⁷ As a representation of the entire world, it far exceeded all previous councils, and in importance it ranks as one of the most remarkable events of the nineteenth century.

The Archbishop's birthday, February 26, 1870, was celebrated by the Cincinnati students at the American College, Rome, by an address and presentation of a handsome set of breviaries. He received, also, a handsome mitre from the Countess Pourtalis. It was embroidered in arabesques with nine

⁸⁴ Archives Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio.

⁸⁵ Archives Cincinnati Archdiocese.

⁸⁶ Archives Cincinnati Archdiocese.

⁸⁷ Archives Cincinnati Archdiocese.

of the purest amethysts, large as plums, on each side, and the inscription "In Fide Vivo" on a scroll.⁸⁸ The great question settled in the Vatican Council was the Papal Infallibility. There were three classes of dissentients to the promulgation of the dogma:

1. The Gallicans teaching the opposite of the proposed dogma.
2. Those who believed the doctrine, but did not think it capable of definition because the tradition of the Church was not sufficiently clear on that point.

3. Those who believed the doctrine and thought it capable of definition, but who considered that the definition would be perilous to the Church and who for the sake of peace and the good of souls, would have it postponed.

This third class was called "The Inopportunist," and Archbishop Purcell was one of the leaders. It embraced about one-fifth of the bishops. Archbishop Purcell and others obtained permission to leave Rome before the final vote was taken. Four hundred and thirty-five Fathers of the Council assembled on July 18, under the Presidency of Pope Pius IX, and all voted *placet* excepting two, one of whom was Bishop Edward Fitzgerald, of Little Rock.⁸⁹ The world at large, especially the press, felt great interest and curiosity as to the utterances of Archbishop Purcell on the subject, since he was known as a strong member of the minority. He was invited to give a lecture in the Catholic Institute Hall on his return to Cincinnati, and his clergy felt it would be an occasion of great importance. Reporters from five of the largest newspapers in New York had been sent to take his speech, and the telegraph wires between Cincinnati and New York had been chartered for five hours, the night of the lecture, to transmit his expressions for the next morning's papers. One of his priests advised him of this and said, "This is your chance to

⁸⁸ Archives Cincinnati Archdiocese.

⁸⁹ *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. xv, pp. 303-309. MACCAFFREY, Rev. Jas., *History of the Catholic Church in Nineteenth Century*, Vol. i, pp. 438-469, St. Louis, 1909; *Catholic Telegraph*, August, 1870.

GIBBONS, JAMES CARDINAL, *Retrospect of Fifty Years*, Vol. ii, p. 129, Baltimore, 1916.

FARLEY, JOHN CARDINAL, *The Life of John Cardinal McCloskey*, pp. 284-289, New York, 1918.

tell the world your views on Papal Infallibility." His opening words at the Catholic Institute were, "I am here to proclaim my belief in the Infallibility of the Pope, in the words of the Holy Father defining the doctrine." One of the Cincinnati papers expressed disappointment that Archbishop Purcell yielded so readily.⁹⁰

At this time a diocesan community of Mother Seton's Daughters was established in Pennsylvania by the aid of the Cincinnati Sisters and through the cooperation of Archbishop Purcell with Bishop Domenec's wishes.⁹¹

The first Bishop of Michigan, a pioneer priest of Cincinnati, Bishop Rese, died at Hildesheim on December 29, 1871. Archbishop Purcell celebrated a Solemn Requiem Mass in the Cathedral for the repose of his soul. A few months later he consecrated two of his priests, the Right Reverend Richard Gilmour, Bishop of Cleveland, and the Right Reverend Joseph Dwenger, Bishop of Fort Wayne.⁹²

In the years which passed between the Vatican Council and the Golden Jubilee of Archbishop Purcell in 1876, his activity seemed as vigorous as in the earlier days when he was laying the structure of his great Archdiocese. Churches were increasing in number and smaller ones were being replaced by imposing edifices, educational establishments were reaching forth to the highest point of efficiency, the Seminary registered one hundred and thirty students, and had a splendid faculty, while the religious communities were growing apace, supplying the wants of the people. Not only at home was the Archbishop busy and interested, but a glance at his correspondence shows calls from many quarters of the world, for help, advice, encouragement or protection. Accustomed to the best society of the Old and New World, a linguist, a delightful speaker, he had the faculty given to very few of selecting from a thousand words the very simplest to convey his meaning. Children delighted his soul, and festivals for them on the Cathedral grounds were of frequent occurrence. His humility was as noticeable as his simplicity, hospitality and charity.⁹³

⁹⁰ Archives Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*

⁹² *Ibid.*

⁹³ Archives Cincinnati Archdiocese.

The fiftieth anniversary of his ordination occurred on May 21, 1876.⁹⁴ It was the first celebration of the kind in the American Church and therefore an event of great importance not only in the annals of the Cincinnati diocese but likewise in the history of the Catholic Church in the United States. It was made noteworthy by all the religious pomp and ceremony such an occasion would call forth on account of the prelate's own eminence, and also by the grandeur his many spiritual sons in the episcopacy furnished. The religious orders which owed him their place in the country and in his diocese, the institutions of learning of which he had been the inspiration, the hundreds of churches whose congregations he had encouraged, the people of the city and state who felt themselves honored to claim him—all presented rich testimonials of love and congratulation. The Chalice which he used on his Jubilee Day was of purest gold set with gems—a gift from his own priests and a true love-offering. The Bishops of the Province gave him a pectoral cross set with fifty half-carat diamonds and a full carat diamond in the center. An account of the week's festivities would fill a volume. It was apparent that the secular and religious celebrations, the various institutions of his own Province and those governed by prelates of his own training, vied with one another in paying him honor; but the rivalry was not discordant—it was rather the outburst of overflowing gratitude and reverential love.

For every joy there seems an attendant sorrow. News came to the Archbishop of the death of his old friend, Father McElroy, in September, and that of Archbishop Bayley in October. In February, 1878, Pope Pius IX closed his eventful career,⁹⁵ and shortly afterwards there was a disturbance in the financial markets and banks which held diocesan funds either as loans or deposits closed their doors. During the financial crisis of 1837, the sterling honesty of the Archbishop and his brother, Father Edward, had induced their fellow-citizens to urge them to receive deposits and use them for the needs of the diocese. In the days of the Civil War other sums were added, and Father Purcell's notes promised the legal interest, six per cent in Ohio. In the

⁹⁴ *Catholic Telegraph*, February 19, 1875; *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. iii, pp. 773-776, Vol. xii, pp. 570-572.

⁹⁵ *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. iii, pp. 773-776.

period of reconstruction after the war, Father Purcell ceased taking loans and tried to free himself from the burden of the earlier deposits, but the people insisted on leaving the money in his hands. Previous to the collapse of 1878-1879, there had been several financial crises. Property had depreciated and securities had lessened in value so that a crisis was imminent. It came when smaller banks like those of Adae, Hemann, and Bussing, in which Father Purcell had deposits, became insolvent. In the hope of doing justice to all creditors, the Archbishop made an assignment. John B. Mannix was the assignee. He invested the money paid to him, advantageously, as he thought, but the securities proved worthless, making the obligations heavier.⁹⁶

The Court then appointed Judge Tafel and Attorney Miller, non-Catholics. Many complications followed, but no better results in the liquidation of the debt. By the persistent efforts of the clergy and the Archbishop's Counsel, order was brought out of chaos, true notes were separated from false, the Court came to a decision on the amount due, and it was paid in a reasonable time but not until it had cost the diocese the lives of three great men: Archbishop Purcell, Father Edward Purcell, and Doctor Francis Joseph Pabisch, the President of Mount St. Mary's of the West. Archbishop Purcell, overwhelmed by the disaster, and hoping some younger person might be appointed who could cope with the trouble, sent his resignation to Rome in January, 1879. The Holy Father, Pope Leo XIII, through Cardinal Simeoni, announced, on March 21, that he would not accept the resignation, but would give a coadjutor. The Right Reverend William Henry Elder, Bishop of Natchez, was appointed Coadjutor Bishop of Avara, and reached Cincinnati on March 3, 1880.⁹⁷

In the light of the revelations of the late world war it seems possible that it might have been the aim of some silent force to bring about the destruction of Archbishop Purcell's great influence. This conviction grows stronger as the documents are studied. He wielded a power granted to few; he reached an eminence in Church and State not attained by many. Future years and unpublished documents may dissipate the cloud and remove the words "financial failure."

⁹⁶ KELLY and KIRWIN, *op. cit.*, pp. 310-234.

⁹⁷ Archives Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio; Archives Cincinnati Archdiocese.

The last public act of Archbishop Purcell was to confer the degree Doctor of Sacred Theology on Father Callaghan, his secretary, in the Cathedral on February 8, 1879. The honor was conferred by the Pope in recognition of Father Callaghan's able elucidation of the Dogma of Infallibility, as published by him in the *Catholic Telegraph*.⁹⁸

The Archbishop died on July 4, 1883, mourned as only a beloved Father could be mourned. What a burden of sorrow he would have escaped had Pope Pius IX, in 1862, approved of his wish to retire to a monastery. The Pope's answer was: *Nemo salvabitur nisi perseveraverit*. He persevered to the end. The cloud which appeared at the sunset of his life had almost passed, leaving his memory and his works the more brilliant and attractive.

His Golden Jubilee as Bishop would have been celebrated three months later, on October 13, 1883.⁹⁹

His solemn obsequies in the Cathedral of Cincinnati were attended by archbishops and bishops from almost every diocese in the country. The sermon, powerful in its eloquence and touching in its tenderness, was delivered by the Bishop of Cleveland, the Right Reverend Richard Gilmour, D.D. The funeral train which had borne the Archbishop's body from St. Martin's returned with it to the little mound near the resting places of his mother and that brother whose whole-hearted trust of humankind had brought to both an insurmountable sorrow.

The impetus given to the Archdiocese of Cincinnati by its Patriarch, the Most Reverend John Baptist Purcell, D.D., of itself would have carried forward for many years the religious and intellectual activity, but fortunately Archbishop Elder, as Coadjutor and successor, kept before his mind the ideals of his predecessor, likewise his preceptor, and with his own devotion to the cause of virtue and learning kept the light of each burning brilliantly. He had for powerful allies many of his clergy, several of whom were called to wear the purple, notably the present Archbishop of Cincinnati, the Bishop of Nashville, and the late Bishop of Grand Rapids.

In the minds of people at a distance, the name of Archbishop

⁹⁸ Archives Cincinnati Archdiocese.

⁹⁹ *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. xii, pp. 570-572; Archives Cincinnati Archdiocese.

Purcell may be associated with the so-called "Failure." Failure means death, but Archbishop Purcell lives today, in his episcopal city and province, and in the history of the Church in America. Like his Master whom he served for fourscore years, he walked about doing good and his works remain. *Si monumentum quaeris, circumspice.* What can be said of the material, may be affirmed still more strongly of the moral, intellectual, and spiritual. He created a diocese with a history and traditions unsurpassed in the Church of God.

SISTER MARY AGNES McCANN, Ph.D.,
Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio.

MISCELLANY

II

LIST OF PRELATES PRESENT AT THE FIRST ANNUAL MEETING OF THE HIERARCHY, AT THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA, WASHINGTON, D. C., SEPTEMBER 24 AND 25, 1919.

(Contributed by Rt. Rev. Owen B. Corrigan, D.D.)

His Eminence, James, Cardinal Gibbons, Abp. Baltimore.

His Eminence, William, Cardinal O'Connell, Abp. Boston.

THIRTEEN ARCHBISHOPS:

The Most Rev. Alexander Christie, Oregon City.

Jeremiah J. Harty, Omaha.

John J. Glennon, St. Louis.

Sebastian G. Messmer, Milwaukee.

Henry Moeller, Cincinnati.

James J. Keane, Dubuque.

Edward J. Hanna, San Francisco.

George W. Mundelein, Chicago.

John W. Shaw, New Orleans.

Dennis J. Dougherty, Philadelphia.

Austin Dowling, St. Paul.

Patrick J. Hayes, New York.

Albert A. Daeger, O. F. M., Santa Fe.

SEVENTY-EIGHT BISHOPS.

Province of Baltimore:

The Rt. Rev. Patrick J. Donahue, Wheeling.

John J. Monaghan, Wilmington.

Denis J. O'Connell, Richmond.

Michael J. Curley, St. Augustine.

William T. Russell, Charleston.

Leo Haid, V. Apost. of N. Carolina.

Owen B. Corrigan, Auxiliary of Baltimore.

Province of Boston:

The Rt. Rev. Thomas D. Beaven, Springfield.

Louis S. Walsh, Portland.

George A. Guertin, Manchester.

Daniel F. Feehan, Fall River.

Joseph J. Rice, Burlington.

John J. Nilan, Hartford.

Joseph G. Anderson, Auxiliary of Boston.

William A. Hickey, Coadjutor of Providence.

Province of Chicago:

The Rt. Rev. Peter J. Muldoon, Rockford.
Edmund M. Dunne, Peoria.
Henry Althoff, Belleville.

Province of Cincinnati:

The Rt. Rev. Herman Alerding, Ft. Wayne.
James J. Hartley, Columbus.
Joseph Chartrand, Indianapolis.
Edward D. Kelly, Grand Rapids.
Joseph Schrembs, Toledo.
Michael J. Gallagher, Detroit.
Ferdinand Brossart, Covington.

Province of Dubuque:

The Rt. Rev. Charles J. O'Reilly, Lincoln.
James Davis, Davenport.
Patrick A. McGovern, Cheyenne.
James A. Duffy, Grand Island.
Thomas W. Drumm, Des Moines.
Edmond Heelan, Auxiliary of Sioux City.

Province of Milwaukee:

The Rt. Rev. James Schwebach, La Crosse.
Frederick Eis, Marquette.
Joseph M. Koudelka, Superior.
Paul P. Rhode, Green Bay.

Province of New Orleans:

The Rt. Rev. Edward P. Allen, Mobile.
Cornelius Van De Ven, Alexandria.
John B. Morris, Little Rock.
Joseph P. Lynch, Dallas.
John E. Gunn, S. M., Natchez.
Paul J. Nussbaum, C. P., Corpus Christi.
Christopher E. Byrne, Galveston.
Arthur J. Drossaerts, San Antonio.
Jules B. Jeanmard, Lafayette.

Province of Philadelphia:

The Rt. Rev. Michael J. Hoban, Scranton.
Eugene A. Garvey, Altoona.
J. F. Regis Canevin, Pittsburgh.
Philip R. McDevitt, Harrisburg.
John J. McCort, Auxiliary of Philadelphia.¹
John M. Gannon, Auxiliary of Erie.

¹ Now Coadjutor of Altoona.

Province of St. Louis:

The Rt. Rev. Maurice F. Burke, St. Joseph.
John J. Hennessy, Wichita.
Thomas F. Lillis, Kansas City.
John Ward, Leavenworth.

Province of New York:

The Rt. Rev. Charles E. McDonnell, Brooklyn.
John J. O'Connor, Newark.
Thomas F. Hickey, Rochester.
John Grimes, Syracuse.
Thomas J. Walsh, Trenton.
Edmund F. Gibbons, Albany.
William Turner, Buffalo.
Joseph H. Conroy, Auxiliary of Ogdensburg.

Province of Oregon City:

The Rt. Rev. Edward J. O'Dea, Seattle.
Mathias C. Lenihan, Great Falls.
John P. Carroll, Helena.
Joseph F. McGrath, Baker City.

Province of St. Paul:

The Rt. Rev. Joseph F. Busch, St. Cloud.
Patrick F. Heffron, Winona.
Jeremiah J. Lawler, Lead.
James O'Reilly, Fargo.
Vincent Wehrle, O. S. B., Bismarck.
John T. McNicholas, O. P., Duluth.

Province of San Francisco:

The Rt. Rev. Joseph S. Glass, C. M., Salt Lake.
John J. Cantwell, Los Angeles.

Province of Santa Fe:

The Rt. Rev. J. Henry Tihen, Denver.
Anthony J. Schuler, S. J., El Paso.

The Rt. Rev. Thomas J. Shahan, Rector of the Catholic University of America, Rt. Rev. William A. Jones, O. S. A., Porto Rico, and Right Rev. Joseph R. Crimont, V. Ap., Alaska.

The following were not present:

The Most Rev. John B. Pitaval, Titular, Abp. of Amida.
The Rt. Rev. Benjamin J. Keiley, Savannah.
Matthew Harkins, Providence.
Philip A. Garrigan, Sioux City.
Theophile Meerschaert, Oklahoma.
J. M. Laval, Auxiliary of New Orleans.

Henry Gabriels, Ogdensburg.
 Augustin F. Schinner, Spokane.
 Daniel M. Gorman, Boise.
 John E. FitzMaurice, Erie.
 John F. Cunningham, Concordia.
 Thomas O'Gorman, Sioux Falls.
 Timothy Corbett, Crookston.
 Thomas Grace, Sacramento.
 Henry Granjon, Tucson.
 James Trobec, Titular Bp. of Lycopolis.
 James Ryan, Alton.
 Alexander J. McGavick, Auxiliary of Chicago.
 Peter J. O'Reilly, Auxiliary of Peoria.
 Thomas Byrne, Nashville.
 John P. Farrelly, Cleveland.
 Denis O'Donaghue, Louisville.

DOCUMENTS

THE APPOINTMENT OF FATHER JOHN CARROLL AS PREFECT- APOSTOLIC OF THE CHURCH IN THE NEW REPUBLIC

(1783-1785)

When the Revolutionary War broke out between the Thirteen Colonies and England in 1775, ecclesiastical intercourse between London and the Catholic clergy in the future republic came to an end. There is no record in Bishop Challoner's correspondence of any reference to the Church in America at this time.¹ From 1743, down to the beginning of the Revolution, Bishop Petre of the London District (1734-1758), and his coadjutor and successor, Bishop Challoner (1741-1781), used every available argument with the ecclesiastical authorities at Rome to rid themselves of the burden of ruling the Church "on the mainland and in the islands of North America," by creating a separate Vicariate-Apostolic in English America.² Bishop Challoner did not succeed in freeing himself of the unwelcome task of caring for the Catholics in the English colonies. The Holy See was not certain that the Catholics there could support their own Chief Shepherd, and the problem of erecting the colonial Church into a separate jurisdiction was further complicated by two factors: the evident antagonism on the part of the colonial Catholics to the appointment of a bishop over them (1765),³ and the suppression of the Jesuits in America (1773).⁴ It was not until a decade later, when Challoner's successor, Bishop James Talbot, refused to exercise jurisdiction in the matter of giving faculties to two American priests then in England (1783), that the Holy See decided to take action. So far as the English Catholic Church was concerned, there was no evidence of any interest on the part of the London Vicar-Apostolic to provide for the Catholic rebels of the new Republic of the United States. Bishop James Talbot appears but once

¹ Cf. *Bishop Challoner's American Jurisdiction* (1758-1781), in BURTON, *Life and Times of Bishop Challoner*, Vol. ii, pp. 123-148. London, 1909.

² The history of the exercise of ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the English Colonies has not yet been told in a consecutive manner. There are some historical data in HUGHES, *History of the Society of Jesus in North America*, Text, Vol. ii, pp. 81-83, 85-87, 127, 133, 583. From 1634 (the foundation year of Maryland), down to 1696, the year of the special decree *Alias a particulari*, of Innocent XII, by which an attempt was made to bring harmony between the Jesuits and the Seculars, there is no evidence for the exercise of canonical rights over the Colonies by the ecclesiastical superiors of England. In 1715, it was admitted by the Maryland clergy that they were uncertain whether they were under London or Quebec. With but few exceptions, and those doubtful in their nature, the real assumption of jurisdiction by the London Vicar-Apostolic is synchronous with Challoner's attempt, in 1743, to rid the Church in England of the bothersome colonies. Cf. *The London Vicariate-Apostolic and the West Indies*, article by HUGHES, in the *Dublin Review*, Vol. cxxxiv, pp. 66-93.

³ Campbell (USCHS *Hist. Records and Studies*, Vol. i, pp. 251-276) treats this aspect of the question in his article: *The Beginnings of the American Hierarchy*; cf. BURTON, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 136-139. For the singular share given to the question of Confirmation in the correspondence between London and Rome at this time, cf. HUGHES *The Sacrament of Confirmation in the Old Colonies*, article in the *Ecclesiastical Review*, Vol. xxv, pp. 23-40.

⁴ SHRA, *Hist. of the Cath. Church in the United States*, vol. ii, p. 77 (facsimile of Challoner's order for the Suppression in America); for a facsimile of the Act of Submission, see HUGHES, *op. cit.*, Documents, Vol. ii, p. 607.

in the correspondence of these two critical years in the life of the American Church (1783-1785), and then merely as the recipient of a letter from the Cardinal-Prefect of Propaganda, Antonelli, dated Rome, June 19, 1784, advising him that the Church in the United States was free and independent of English rule.⁶

The clergy and the faithful in the Colonies, however, were not acephalous during the war. When the suppression of the Society of Jesus was announced by Bishop Challoner in October, 1773, the acting Superior, Father John Lewis, Vicar-General of the London Vicar-Apostolic, continued to be recognized by the clergy—without exception, all ex-Jesuits—as their legitimate head. After Yorktown (1781), there could have been no question of appealing to Bishop James Talbot, brother of the Earl of Shrewsbury, for guidance; and once the final Treaty of Peace with Great Britain was signed on September 25, 1783, the line of cleavage was complete.

During this time, a General Chapter of the American clergy was called. Meetings were held at Whitemarsh in 1783-1784—from June 27, 1783, to October 11, 1784. A *Form of Government* in nineteen sections; *Rules for the Particular Government of the Clergy*, in six sections; and *Regulations respecting the Management of Plantations*, in eight sections, were passed with the approval of those present.⁶ The two principal questions before this Constitutional Assembly of the American clergy were: *the maintenance of ecclesiastical life and discipline*; and, *the preservation of ecclesiastical property*, which by this time had become considerable.

It is the first of these problems which interests us here.

Father Thomas Hughes, S.J., has written four large volumes, entitled *The History of the Society of Jesus in North America, Colonial and Federal*, to explain the second.⁷

The Constitution adopted at the last meeting of this General Chapter (October 11, 1784), remained in force until 1805, when the Society of Jesus was partially restored in the United States. (The universal restoration of the Society in 1814, rendered further adherence to the *Rules and Regulations* to a great extent unnecessary). In the Proceedings of the Chapter, October 11, 1784, the following resolution was adopted:

That the Superior in spirituals from the receipt of his faculties be allowed the salary of 100-0-0 sterling per annum, together with a servant, and a chair and horse; that his salary continue until the next ensuing meeting of the Chapter, and then be subject to their further determinations.⁸

Before this Second General Chapter met (again at Whitemarsh) in 1786,

⁶ *Propaganda Documents* (cited as PD), pp. 35-36. These *Documents* (on the appointment of the first Bishop of Baltimore), appeared in the original French, Italian, and Latin, in the *American Historical Review*, for July, 1910, pp. 801-829. They were copied at Rome by Professor Carl Russell Fish, while he was engaged on his *Guide to the Materials for American History in Roman and other Italian Archives* (Washington, 1911), and were translated into English and published by the late American Church historian, Rev. Edward I. Devitt, S.J., in the *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, Vol. xxi, pp. 185-236.

⁷ HUGHES, *op. cit.*, Documents, Vol. ii, pp. 617-637.

⁸ New York (Longmans), 1908.

⁹ HUGHES, *op. cit.*, p. 631.

Father John Carroll had accepted the Prefectship-Apostolic of the Church in the United States. His nomination and acceptance form one of the most interesting pages in American Catholic history. The story has never been fully told, and it is impossible to tell it in a strictly chronological fashion, owing to several complicating factors which touch the main issue at certain points. Some of these factors were: Carroll's attitude toward the acceptance of a post of such importance "from a foreign State," to be held only "at the discretion of a foreign tribunal or congregation [Propaganda Fide]"; the expectation of the American clergy in the speedy restoration of the Society of Jesus; the intrigue at Paris—grouped around the Papal Nuncio, Archbishop Doria Pamphili, the American Minister, Benjamin Franklin, the French Prime Minister, Count de Vergennes, the notorious Talleyrand, then Bishop of Autun, and Cardinal Antonelli, Prefect of Propaganda Fide; and the position assumed by the American clergy at Whitemarsh toward the appointment of a bishop for the United States.

Father John Lewis, the last of the Jesuit Superiors of the Mission before the Suppression, continued to exercise a quasi-jurisdiction over the clergy from 1773, down to the first General Chapter in 1783. He can scarcely be said to have had juridic or canonical powers over his brother-priests. There was a sort of gentlemen's agreement that he should be their leader, but his title of Superior was rather an honorary one. The decade has not incorrectly been called by Hughes a period of inaction—"the ex-Jesuits merely stayed at their posts, discharging in a spiritless way their pastoral duties."⁹ The missions under their care were extensive, as can be seen from the maps published as appendixes to Hughes' *History*. Two Propaganda documents, published in the CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW, give us an accurate account of the state of Catholicism during this period of inaction which corresponds with the Revolutionary War (1773-1783).¹⁰ The first is a *Relation* drawn up by Father John Mattingly, dated September 6, 1773, in which he tells us that the principal residence of the Society was Port Tobacco, in Charles County. The next in order of dignity was the residence at New Town, in St. Mary's County, which formed a sort of "Collegium," as in the early days of the Jesuit Mission in England. From New Town, the Fathers attended the various congregations within a radius of twenty miles, celebrating Holy Mass on Sundays and Holy-days of Obligation. Mattingly's *Relation* gives us a very fair picture of how thoroughly the missions were attended. The want of a bishop to administer the Sacrament of Confirmation was badly felt, but the antipathy of the non-conformist element in Maryland to the presence of an Anglican prelate made the appointment of a Catholic bishop a serious matter. In another hand, at the end of this document we are told that the Catholics in Maryland and Pennsylvania numbered at the time about twenty thousand. In Pennsylvania there was practically complete freedom of worship. It was somewhat restrained

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 608.

¹⁰ Vol. ii, pp. 317-320. A list of the Jesuit Superiors from 1634 to 1773, will be found in FOLEY, *Records, etc. (Collectanea, part I)*, pp. 73-74. A biographical list of all the Jesuits who labored in the American Mission is in HUGHES, *op. cit.*, Text, Vol. ii, pp. 676-704 (Appendix F).

in Maryland.¹¹ The second of these documents, from the same volume of the Propaganda Archives, is apparently of a later date than Father Mattingly's *Relation*. It purports to give a complete *Catalogue of the Jesuit Missions in the United States*. The number of priests was twenty-six at the time. There were twenty-five Scholastics, ten Novices, twenty-five Lay Brothers, and nine Lay Novices—making a total of ninety-five members in the Society. The various missions are given with the approximate distances between the residences of the priests.

Father John Lewis made no attempt to create a central organization for the Church in these scattered missions; and in a letter, dated Maryland, February 20, 1782, from Father John Carroll to his friend, Father Charles Plowden, who was to preach at his consecration at Lulworth Castle, eight years later, we learn that all were not satisfied with the rather loose ecclesiastical system which prevailed at this time:

The clergymen here continue to live in the old form. It is the effect of habit, and if they could promise themselves immortality, it would be well enough. But I regret that indolence prevents any form of administration being adopted, which might tend to secure to posterity a succession of Catholic clergymen, and secure to them a comfortable subsistence. I said, that the former system of administration (that is, everything being in the power of a Superior) continued. But all those checks upon him, so wisely provided by former constitutions, are at an end. It is happy that the present Superior [Father John Lewis] is a person free from every selfish view and ambition. But his successor may not [be] . . . Ignorance, indolence, delusion (you remember certain prophecies of re-establishment), and above all the irresolution of Mr. Lewis, puts a stop to every proceeding in this matter.¹²

Father Carroll at this time had no official position in the American Church. We find him, however, during this same year, 1782, drawing up a *Plan of Organization* for the clergy.¹³ It can be presumed that copies of this were distributed among his fellow priests, for the Chapter of 1783-1784, followed out the main lines of his proposals. The *Plan* is divided into seven paragraphs. Tentative suggestions are given for the maintenance and careful administration of the estates, but nowhere does Carroll imply the necessity of centering the spiritual guidance of the Church under one head. He was preoccupied, as most of his fellow-priests of that day were, with the preservation of the Society's property. "The obligations of justice to the benefactors, who took up or left these estates for pious uses; the sort of consecration which estates from such a destination acquire; the duty of charity to the present and future generations"—these are the motives, and worthy ones, too, for this preoccupation. Rumors were abroad at the time that those who had succeeded in destroying the Society in Europe had designs also upon the temporal possessions of the Jesuits; and Carroll speaks rather emphatically on the question of interference in this regard. Their brethren in England, he said,

¹¹ "I cattolici delle due provincie di Marilandia e Pensilvania saranno circa ventimila. L'esercizio della religione nella prima è libero; nella seconda è totalmente libero."

¹² HUGHES, *op. cit.*, Documents, Vol. ii, p. 609.

¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 609-614.

had "rightly distinguished between the spiritual power derived from the bishop, and which must be left in the hands to which he has intrusted it; and the common rights of the missionaries to their temporal possessions, to which as the bishop, or Pope himself, have no just claim, so neither can they invest any person or persons with the administration of them."

Carroll's views on foreign interference in temporal matters must be kept in mind when we come to examine his attitude toward the Congregation of Propaganda Fide the following year. In a letter to Father Charles Plowden, dated September 26, 1783, there are several statements which have a bearing on this aspect of the problem under consideration in these pages. He writes for instance, during the time the Chapter was in session:

Our gentlemen continue, as when last I wrote. We are endeavoring to establish some regulations tending to perpetuate a succession of labourers in this vineyard, to preserve their morals, to prevent idleness, and to secure an equitable and frugal administration of our temporals. . . . Your information of the intention of Propaganda gives me concern no farther than to hear that men, whose institution was for the service of Religion, should bend their thoughts so much more to the grasping of power, and the commanding of wealth. For they may be assured that they will never get possession of a sixpence of our property here; and, if any of our friends could be weak enough to deliver any real estate into their hands, or attempt to subject it to their authority, our civil government would be called upon to wrest it again out of their dominion. A foreign temporal jurisdiction will never be tolerated here; and even the spiritual supremacy of the Pope is the only reason, why in some of the United States the full participation of all civil rights is not granted to the Roman Catholics. They may therefore send their agents when they please; they will certainly return empty-handed.¹⁴

The following April, 1784, in a letter to the same correspondent, Father Carroll uses language not dissimilar in spirit; this time, however, it is the spiritual jurisdiction of the Congregation which is in question:

But this you may be assured of; that no authority derived from the Propaganda will ever be admitted here; that the Catholic Clergy and Laity here know that the only connexion they ought to have with Rome is to acknowledge the Pope as Spiritual head of the Church, that no Congregations existing in his States shall be allowed to exercise any share of his Spiritual authority here; that no Bishop Vicar-Apostolical shall be admitted, and, if we are to have a Bishop, he shall not be in partibus (a refined political Roman Contrivance), but an ordinary national Bishop, in whose appointment Rome shall have no share; so that we are very easy about their machinations. Our Brethren have, in a meeting held last October, settled or nearly settled a plan of internal government, which will meet with your approbation, being founded on Christian and rational principles, etc.¹⁵

It is difficult to say what was the precise cause of the first general Chapter of the clergy, but if one may judge from the material at hand, it was rather the fear of losing hold on the property which had been amassed since 1634,

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 615-616.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 619-620.

than the realization of their singular canonical situation. The Delegates of the three Districts met at Whitemarsh on November 6, 1783. These were Father John Lewis for the *Northern District* (Pennsylvania and the Eastern Shore of Maryland), Fathers John Carroll and Bernard Diderick for the *Middle District* (the Western Shore of Maryland, except St. Mary's and Charles Counties), and Fathers Ignatius Matthews and James Walton for the *Southern District* (St. Mary's and Charles Counties, with Virginia). A committee was appointed, consisting of these five Delegates, for the purpose of preparing a Petition to the Holy See, asking that Father John Lewis be formally constituted Superior of the Church in the New Republic, with certain episcopal privileges—administering the Sacrament of Confirmation, blessing chalices, and delegating priests for the missions. This Petition gives us a clear idea of the attitude of the clergy toward the problem of a hierarchy of jurisdiction in the American Church. It runs as follows:

Most Holy Father:

We, John Lewis, Bernard Diderick, Ignatius Matthews, James Walton, and John Carroll, missionary priests, residing in the Thirteen United States of North America, assembled together from the neighboring stations to take counsel for the good of the missions, our fellow-priests residing in the more remote parts of this mission agreeing herein and approving by letter, in our name and in the common name of our brethren, with all respect represent to your Holiness, that we, placed under the recent supreme dominion of the United America, can no longer have recourse, as formerly, for necessary spiritual jurisdiction to the Bishops and Vicars-Apostolic residing in different and foreign States (for this has very frequently been intimated to us in very positive terms by the rulers of this Republic), nor recognize any one of them as our ecclesiastical Superior, without open offense of this supreme civil magistracy and political government. Wherefore we, placed in this difficult position have recourse to your Holiness, humbly beseeching you to vouchsafe to confirm anew the ecclesiastical Superior whom we now have, namely, John Lewis, a priest already approved and confirmed by the Vicar-Apostolic of London, to whom this whole mission was subject before the change of political government, and to delegate to him the power of granting the necessary faculties to priests coming into these missions, as it shall seem expedient; that said Superior may delegate this power to at least one or more of the most suitable missionaries as the necessity and distance of time and place may require.

Moreover, as there is no bishop in these regions, who can bless the holy oils, of which we were deprived for several years during the confusion of the war, no one to bless the chalices and altar stones needed, no one to administer the sacrament of confirmation, we humbly beseech your Holiness to empower the said John Lewis, priest, Superior, to perform these things in the present necessity, and until otherwise provided for this mission by your Holiness, that our faithful, living in many dangers, may be no longer deprived of the Sacrament of Confirmation nor die without Extreme Unction according to the rite of the Church.

Moreover, we also pray your Holiness to bestow on this mission the indulgences of the Jubilee, and to extend to the missionaries the ample faculties which may seem seasonable in these vast and remote regions racked by a long bitter war, where on account of the constant military movements, neither the

Jubilee on the exaltation of your Holiness to the See of Peter, nor the Jubilee of the year 1775, could be promulgated, much less celebrated or enjoyed.

This, Most Holy Father, is what the aforesaid petitioners, missionary priests in these regions of United North America, humbly solicit from your Holiness' supreme wisdom and providence for the good of the Catholic Religion.¹⁶

Shea says that this Petition was forwarded through Cardinal Borromeo. Evidently it was presented to Pius VI, as it is still among the Propaganda Archives (*America Centrale*).¹⁷ When its contents became known to the rest of the American clergy, it was feared by some that it was not sufficiently respectful in tone, and accordingly another Committee, of which John Carroll was a member, was appointed to draft a second Petition. This second request for a Superior contained the modification that they be permitted to elect their own Superior; it declared also that the United States Government would not permit the presence of a Bishop in the country. Father Carroll was instructed to send this second Petition to the Holy Father through a friend at Rome. Accompanying the Petition was a long letter from Carroll instructing his friend on the mind of the American clergy toward the establishment of a hierarchy in the United States. The Revolution, he says, had rendered any exercise of spiritual jurisdiction on the part of the London Vicar-Apostolic impossible and even injurious to the welfare of the Church. It was their duty to preserve and improve the "free toleration" allowed to all Christians in the United States, "by demeaning ourselves on all occasions as subjects zealously attached to our Government and by avoiding to give any jealousies on account of any dependence on foreign jurisdiction more than that which is essential to our religion—an acknowledgment of the Pope's spiritual supremacy over the whole Christian world."¹⁸ Father Carroll's views on the question of an American hierarchy were always guided by this distinction. He could see no other way of meeting fairly and honestly the American attitude toward "foreign jurisdiction," except by the appointment of a Bishop Ordinary, with his See in the United States. He instructs his correspondent, therefore, that the Superior asked for in the Petition, should have episcopal powers. This second Petition arrived too late in Rome to have any appreciable effect upon the action of the Holy See in organizing the American Church. The factor which actually hastened the final arrangement, namely, Carroll's nomination to the Prefectship-Apostolic, was an intrigue at Paris for what Shea not unjustly calls the enslavement of the Catholics in this country.¹⁹

At the time when the clergy of the new Republic were holding their meetings at Whitemarsh for the purpose of reorganizing Church government under one of themselves as Superior, who would be subject directly to the Holy See, an interesting and significant series of negotiations were being carried on in Europe, and in particular at Paris, the object of which was to place the nascent American Church under French control. France had proven herself a noble

¹⁶ SHEA, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 209-211.

¹⁷ *Propaganda Archives, America Centrale*, Vol. 2, No. 8.

¹⁸ SHEA, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 211.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 213, note.

ally during the Revolution. In December, 1776, an American mission at Paris, presided over by Benjamin Franklin, had formally asked the assistance of the French government in the great struggle for independence. That the policy of France was to take advantage of England's conflict with the American colonies was understood by all at that time. France was still smarting under the defeat she sustained in the Seven Years' War and she was recognised as the chief sufferer among the continental nations which had been humiliated by England. America's independence would be a great check upon the arrogance of the British navy. The Secretary of Foreign Affairs in France at that time, the Count de Vergennes, was not only in favor of immediate intervention in favor of the rebelling colonists, but was also a warm personal friend of Franklin.²⁰ Burgoyne's surrender, or, as it was called, to spare the English General's feelings, the "convention between Lieutenant-General Burgoyne and Major-General Gates," on October 17, 1777, marked the turning point in the war. From that date down to the victory at Yorktown the Revolution became an international affair. The news reached Paris in December, 1777, and its immediate effect was to hasten the Alliance with France. This was signed on January 17, 1778. Soldiers, money, warships, and supplies were to be furnished to the struggling colonists. Ultimate victory for the Americans was now a certainty. Franklin, in his house at Passy, a suburb of Paris, gathered around him the best men of the French capital, and it was through his shrewdness and statesmanship that the Alliance was kept in vigorous activity until the end of the war. It must be remembered that France was a great Catholic country at this time.²¹ The King, Louis XVI, mediocre as he was in statesmanship, was a most Christian King in more than name, and there is no doubt that every aspect of the future of the new nation then coming into existence was discussed between him and his ministers. The French Alliance was denounced by the loyalists in America as "a horror and an infamy worse than the Declaration of Independence. That Protestant colonists should ally themselves with the great Roman Catholic monarchy, the ancient enemy of the Anglo-Saxon race, and ally themselves for the purpose of making war upon their own faithful and loving mother, England, was a depth of degradation to which, they declared, they had thought it impossible for Americans to descend. They saw in it nothing but ruin, and the Romanizing of America under despotic government. For the rest of the war, and even for some time afterwards, loyalist newspapers and writers never wearied of describing the details of this ruin which they saw so clearly appearing. They were sure that parts of America had been ceded to France by secret clauses in the treaty or would be demanded at the end of the war, and at times they named the particular states. French vessels were on their way to America laden with tons of holy water, casks of consecrated oil, chests of beads, crucifixes, consecrated wafers, mass books, and bales of indulgences, besides the wheels, hooks and pincers of the Inquisition."²²

²⁰ FISHER, *The Struggle for American Independence*, Vol. ii, pp. 113-115. Phila., 1906.

²¹ Cf. *The French Clergy's Gift to America*, in the *Catholic Mind*, Vol. xviii, No. 3 (April, 1920).

²² FISHER, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 120; cf. VAN TYNE, *Loyalists in America*, pp. 132-136, for an excellent summary of the loyalist point of view.

This lingering spirit of anti-Catholic bias was only too familiar to the Catholics resident in the English colonies. From the foundation of Jamestown in 1607, that spirit was ever vigilant. The colonial charters were incomplete without their laws for the "regulation of Popery." The Catholics of Maryland and Pennsylvania, where the great majority of them lived, were in reality during the Revolution breathing the air of freedom for the first time since 1689.³³ All the iniquitous regulations to hinder Catholic freedom of conscience which stand so accusingly upon the Statute Books of England were used in the colonies by colonial agents to stifle Catholic life. The series of colonial laws—Anti-Jesuit, Anti-Papist and otherwise—were more than mere echoes of British bigotry; they were living weapons for murdering the souls of those whose fathers had fled to America for conscience' sake.

The general impression the reader takes from the documents presented to him in such volumes as those of Father Hughes, is that the Catholics of the colonies, while under British rule, had endeavored to avoid, as far as possible, all open conflict with the bigoted anti-Catholic law of those days. There was more than the mere opinion that a bishop was not necessary in 1765, which induced the 256 Catholic laymen of Maryland to send their letter of protest to Father Denny, the English Jesuit Provincial, for the war against France, the French and Indian War of the Colonies (1755-1763), had stirred up violent antagonism to all things Catholic. The Catholics of Maryland were openly accused of sympathizing with the French, on account of their faith, and they had been so bitterly oppressed from 1689 onwards that more than one project of migration was discussed at this time.³⁴ The West Indies seemed a likely refuge in 1727; but later on, during the violent anti-Catholic agitation in Maryland (1750-1760), Charles Carroll and other Catholics of means and prominence were contemplating a migration to French Louisiana. Charles Carroll, while on a visit to his son, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, then a student in France (1756), presented a petition to the French government asking for a grant of land on the Arkansas River.³⁵ The plan did not succeed; but the two projects—one toward the West Indies, the other toward French Louisiana—show that these English subjects thought any country and government preferable to the intolerance of English rule. In spite of the fact that they were "almost reduced to the level with our negroes, not having the privilege of voting for persons to represent us in the Assembly," as the Catholic petition to Governor Sharpe of Maryland read in 1757,³⁶ the Catholics of Maryland and elsewhere were among the first to rally to the cause of the Revolution.³⁷ That their sympathies were with France as against England no one can doubt. All the priests in the Maryland-Pennsylvania Mission had been educated in France, or Belgium, in Colleges which had been set up as a protest to the

³³ HUGHES, *op. cit.*, Text, Vol. II, pp. 154-205.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 490 *seq.*

³⁵ A third plan is mentioned by HUGHES, *ibid.*, p. 547.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 546.

³⁷ GRIFPIN, *Catholics in the American Revolution*, 3 vols., Phila., 1907; RILEY, *The National Debt that American Protestants owe to their Brethren of the Roman Catholic Church*. Annapolis, 1914; O'BRIEN, *A Hidden Phase of American History*. New York, 1919.

prevailing English bigotry of the day.²⁹ Some of these Colleges, like St. Omer's, had been subsidized by the French King. But this sympathy with things French, which was based upon their educational days in Europe and which was strengthened by the short-sighted penal legislation of the colonies, never dulled the spirit of independence possessed by the clergy and the laity in those days. No group of colonists had less reason for being enthusiastic over the Revolution than the Catholics. The colonial attitude over the Quebec Act (1774), was sufficient to chill Catholic interest in the coming Revolution. But larger interests prevailed, and the pages of American history present the rather significant situation of one Church, persecuted from the very beginning of English colonization, throwing all its efforts into the cause of liberty, and in some cases, like that of Charles Carroll of Carrollton, then the richest private gentleman in the colonies, its wealth as well, and another Church, which had waxed fat and rich on the spoils of ecclesiastical graft and other unworthy measures, holding out to the bitter end against American independence.

It is difficult not to enter upon the story of the effort made in France at this time (1783-1784), to give an organized hierarchy to the Church in the new Republic, without considerable suspicion of all concerned. The leading fact to be kept in mind, however, for a cautious judgment on the whole episode is Franklin's prompt acquiescence in the appointment of John Carroll once the latter's name was seriously considered. The whole episode can be very easily followed in the diplomatic and ecclesiastical correspondence which we have already spoken of as the *Propaganda Documents*.³⁰

In the *Instruction*³¹ sent by the Congregation of Propaganda Fide to Prince Doria Panphili, Archbishop of Seleucia, and Apostolic Nuncio at Paris, dated January 15, 1783, the Nuncio is reminded that the occasion of the general peace which was to be concluded among the nations of Europe was an important one for the future of the Church in the new Republic across the seas. He is informed that up to the outbreak of the Revolutionary War, all the possessions of England on the continent, or on the islands, of America were under the spiritual jurisdiction of the Vicar-Apostolic of London. "The approaching declaration of the independence of all those provinces," he is informed, "will destroy the bonds of their political and civil subordination to the British government; it will thereby destroy all bonds in religious matters, and, therefore, the Vicar-Apostolic of London will be deprived of the influence and direction he has exercised until now in the religious affairs of those provinces."³² The Nuncio should, therefore, exert his own power with the court of France, to the end that, through the influence which the King has with the leaders of the American Congress, he may obtain the insertion of an article in the

²⁹ GUILDAY, *English Catholic Refugees on the Continent (1550-1795)*, Vol. i, pp. 141, 154, 229, 275, 280, London, 1914; DEVITT, *Bohemia*, in the *ACHS Records*, Vol. xxiii, pp. 97-139; cf. HUGHES, *Educational Convoys to Europe in the Olden Times*, in the *Ecclesiastical Review*, Vol. xxix, pp. 24-39.

³⁰ See note 5.

³¹ For the diplomatic and historical value of these Instructions, cf. CAUCHIE-MARRE, *Recueil des Instructions G n rales aux Nonces de Flandre*, pp. iii-ix, Brussels, 1914.

³² PD, p. 4.

Treaty of Peace "concerning the free exercise and the maintenance of the Catholic religion." His Most Christian Majesty, Louis XVI, was to be approached on the question of assuming the *patronatus* of the Church in the new Republic. A plan for establishing new missions and for sending missionaries to the new Republic was to be discussed, if the opportunity offered itself. A most desirable method of organizing the Church in the United States "would be to establish in one of the principal cities a Vicar-Apostolic, with episcopal character, chosen from among the subjects of the new Republic, who should receive from the Holy See powers for the spiritual government of the Catholics of all those regions, and who, thereafter, should receive the charge of establishing various missionary stations, more or less numerous, according to the requirements of each province."²² A Bishop Vicar-Apostolic was proposed by the Holy See, not only because he would be able to guide the Church and confer on the Catholics all they needed to render their spiritual life complete, but also because "national jealousy could thus be obviated, by not constraining these new republicans to receive those sacraments [Confirmation and Holy Orders] from foreign bishops."²³ The Holy See recognized that the members of the American Congress might not be willing to allow a Catholic bishop to enter the United States; if such should prove to be the case, a native American might be appointed Prefect, with the title of Vicar-Apostolic, enjoying episcopal power, except for the administration of Holy Orders. The rule is laid down in this *Instruction* to the Nuncio that if a native American should be available for this important post, he should be preferred, whether for the simple Prefecture or for the Vicariate-Apostolic. If an available American should not be found, then Congress should be asked to allow a foreigner to be appointed. It would appear also from the text of the *Instruction* that Congress was to be given the privilege of stating whether the choice was acceptable or not. The maintenance of the new ecclesiastical head in the United States should also be discussed, and in case no help be proffered, the Congregation of Propaganda Fide would be ready to assign an allowance to the new Bishop, to the Prefect, or the Vicar-Apostolic. The Holy See no doubt hoped that if the missionaries who would go to America were Frenchmen, the King would assist them "from his royal and liberal munificence."

Less than a month later, on February 10, 1783, Doria Pamphili replied to Cardinal Antonelli that he had transmitted His Eminence's wishes to the Prime Minister, Count de Vergennes,²⁴ at a conference held on Tuesday of the preceding week. Article VIII of the peace preliminaries (signed on November 30, 1782), between England and America, had secured religious

²² PD, p. 5.

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ Charles Gravier Vergennes, Prime Minister of France, born at Dijon in 1717, died at Paris, 1787. Entered the diplomatic service under Chavigny, French ambassador at Lisbon. Appointed in 1750, Minister to Elector of Treves. Six years later, became Ambassador at Constantinople. Recalled in 1766, was later (1771) appointed to Stockholm. Louis XVI gave him the post of Secretary of Foreign Affairs, and it was in this capacity that he concluded the Franco-American alliance on January 26, 1778. Had he lived, he might have prevented the French Revolution.

peace to the new Republic. The Prime Minister saw no difficulty in establishing a Vicariate-Apostolic in America, with an American having episcopal power, and the Nuncio begged him to inform Mr. Franklin, the minister plenipotentiary of the new Republic, that he desired to treat with him on this important matter. The main object of France in the war was American Independence, and while John Jay and John Adams, two of the American commissioners, were very suspicious of the intentions of France, Franklin never lost the fullest confidence in our ally. France had been forced to give up so much for the hard-won independence of the new Republic that it is not surprising to find Franklin willing, probably anxious, partially to recompense France by allowing the government to have control over the Church in the United States.

Cardinal Antonelli replied on March 19, 1783, telling the Nuncio what a great consolation his letter of February 10, had been to all in Rome. He is especially cheered by the hope that Catholic missionaries will be tolerated in the United States and that a native Vicar-Apostolic will be permitted to reside in the new Republic. Six months were to pass before the Nuncio was able to report on the results of his promised interview with Mr. Franklin. On September 1, 1783, two days before the definitive Treaty of Peace was signed, Doria Pamphili wrote to the Cardinal, telling him that he was transmitting a *dossier* of three papers, marked A, B, and C, respectively, relating to the organization of the Church in the United States, and giving to the Prefect a complete account of the negotiations entered into up to that date:

I have the honor of transmitting to Your Eminence, herewith, three papers marked A, B, and C, respectively, and relating to the establishment of apostolic missions in the new republic of the United States of North America, which matter was committed to me. The first is a copy of a note or memorandum, that I sent to Mr. Franklin, minister plenipotentiary of the new republic, the second and third are copies of a note of Mr. Franklin and of some observations made by him on the subject of my note just mentioned. In order to take time to send a categorical reply to Mr. Franklin, I merely acknowledged the receipt of these papers, in which your Eminence will find Mr. Franklin to be of opinion that our court, or, in other words, the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda, will be free to take all measures that may be useful to the Catholics of America, without infringing the constitutions, and that the congress will not fail tacitly to approve the choice that the Sacred Congregation may make, in concert with the minister plenipotentiary of the United States of a French ecclesiastic, who, residing in France, may regulate the affairs of Catholics in America, through a suffragan there. In this connection, I am of the opinion that, rather than a French ecclesiastic, the apostolic nuncio for the time being in France, in concert with that Sacred Congregation, might, himself, invest an ecclesiastic with the character of bishop, of prefect, or of vicar-apostolic for the government in question. There being in America, as Mr. Franklin says in his note C, no college or establishment in which a Catholic ecclesiastic may receive the instruction that it is necessary for him to have, nor the hope of a public appropriation for such a purpose, Your Eminence will recognize that recourse must be had to other means in this connection, and that those suggested by Mr. Franklin in his note C, concerning the four establishments

of English Religious that exist in France, could not, and should not, be proposed, much less, accepted. The last paragraph of that note deserves all attention, tending as it does, to the attainment of desirable ends. I have thought it well to give information of the contents of these papers to the Count of Vergennes, a true statesman, full of zeal and attachment for our holy Catholic religion; and as I begged of him to facilitate the means of establishing a college in France for the education of as many priests as may be necessary for the spiritual welfare of the Roman Catholics who now are, or may come to be, in the States of the new republic, the royal minister, assuring me that he will give all the assistance that it may be in his power to lend in that connection, suggested that I speak to Monseigneur the bishop of Autun, minister of ecclesiastical benefices of this realm, in order that he, by his lights, and by his good offices, may assist in the establishment of the proposed college, at St. Malo, Nantes, L'Orient, or any other city of France, near the coast, it being necessary, however, first to obtain the requisite funds, and to know, approximately, the number of priests that the Roman Catholics of the United States may need, and whether there be in that country, individuals inclined to undertake the studies and to adopt the ecclesiastical state. Accordingly, I had an interview with Monseigneur the bishop of Autun, on Wednesday, and we agreed to confer together, on Saturday of last week, with the Count of Vergennes. To this end, on the day appointed, I went to Versailles, and the Count of Vergennes, as well as the above-named prelate, showed himself to be desirous of obtaining the funds necessary for so important an end. While this matter is being thought over, I trust that your Eminence will give me what information you have in regard to the mission of North America, and will obtain further information from the prelate who is in charge of that mission, requesting him to give the number of priests that are in those states, and the number of them that may be needed there. In quest of this information, after receiving the answer of Your Eminence, I will endeavor to obtain that the Count of Vergennes write to the Chevalier de la Luzerne, who has been minister plenipotentiary of the Most Christian King to the United States of North America for the last three years, and who is much esteemed and loved there. On the other hand, Your Eminence will deign to inform neither the ecclesiastic just mentioned nor any one else, with the exception of the Holy Father, of my negotiations with the Count of Vergennes and with Monseigneur the bishop of Autun, since it is question, as yet, of a mere project, of which it would not be well to speak before it be realized, or developed sufficiently not to be frustrated by any one who may regard the proposed establishment unfavorably. Ready ever to comply with the revered commands of Your Eminence, I subscribe myself, with all homage,

*Of Your Eminence,
the Very Humble, Devoted, and Grateful Servant,
G. ARCHBISHOP OF SELEUCIA.*

Paris, September 1st, 1783. "

The first note (NOTE A) is a copy of a memorandum which the Nuncio had sent to Mr. Franklin on July 28, 1783, requesting him to transmit the same to the American Congress and to support it with his influence:

^{*} PD, pp. 8-11.

Note A

Before the revolution that has just been consummated in North America, the Catholics and the missionaries of those provinces were in spiritual dependence upon the Vicar-Apostolic residing at London. It is obvious that this arrangement can not be continued; but, as it is essential that the Catholic subjects of the United States have an ecclesiastic to govern them in what concerns their religion, the Congregation of Propaganda Fide, which exists at Rome with a view to the establishment and preservation of the missions, has determined to propose to the Congress the installation of one of their Catholic subjects, in some city of the United States of North America, with the powers of Vicar-Apostolic and with the character of Bishop, or simply as Prefect-Apostolic. The establishment of a Bishop Vicar-Apostolic seems to be preferable, all the more, since this would enable the Catholic subjects of the United States to receive confirmation and Holy Orders in their own country, instead of being obliged to go to foreign countries to receive those Sacraments; and as it might happen, at times, that no one be found among the subjects of the United States qualified to be entrusted with the spiritual government, whether as Bishop or as Prefect-Apostolic, it would be necessary in such cases that Congress be pleased to consent that the choice be made among the Bishops of a foreign nation, the most friendly to the United States.²²

Shea tells us that the Nuncio transmitted also to the French Minister in the United States, the Chevalier de la Luzerne, a similar letter addressed to the Senior Catholic Missionary in the United States. Note B is a résumé of Franklin's reply to the Nuncio. The American Minister, after mature reflection on the matter contained in the Nuncio's letter of July 28, decided that "it would be absolutely useless to send it to Congress, which, according to its power and constitution, cannot and should not in any case intervene in the ecclesiastical affairs of any sect or religion established in America." Mr. Franklin was of the opinion that the Holy See was entirely free in taking whatever measures which might be useful to the Catholics of America, without infringing the Constitution, and that Congress would not fail to give a tacit approval to the choice made by the Sacred Congregation. But, as the Note goes on to say, it was understood that the choice in question would be "of a French ecclesiastic; who, residing in France, may regulate the spiritual affairs of the Catholics who live, or who may come to establish themselves, in those states, through a suffragan residing in America."

Note B

Observations on the Note of M. the Apostolic Nuncio.

Mr. Franklin, after reading the note of M. the Nuncio and reflecting upon it maturely, believes that it would be absolutely useless to send it to the Congress, which according to its power and constitution cannot, and should not, in any case, intervene in the ecclesiastical affairs of any sect or of any religion established in America. Each particular state has reserved to itself by its own constitution the right to protect its members, to tolerate their religious opinions and not to interfere with the matter, as long as they do not disturb civil order.

²² PD, p. 11.

Mr. Franklin is therefore of opinion that the Court of Rome may take, of its own initiative, all the measures that may be useful to the Catholics of America, without disregard to the constitutions and that Congress will not fail to give its tacit approval to the choice that the Court of Rome in concert with the minister of the United States may make of a French Ecclesiastic who, residing in France, may regulate the spiritual affairs of the Catholics who may live or who may come to establish themselves in those states through a suffragan residing in America.

Besides many political reasons that may make that arrangement desirable, the Apostolic Nuncio must find in it many others that may be favorable to the intentions of the Court of Rome.²⁷

A third NOTE (C) contained a most surprising suggestion. The Cardinal Prefect had laid stress on the necessity of maintenance for the Vicar-Apostolic of the new Republic, and Franklin suggests to the Nuncio that, since there is in America no college or establishment where a Catholic ecclesiastic might receive the necessary preparation, the four monasteries of the English Benedictine monks, the annual revenues of which amounted to almost 60,000 livres, might be used for this purpose. "It is possible," so runs NOTE C, "that the King of France, to please the Court of Rome and to strengthen the bonds of friendship with the United States, would permit these establishments to train, instruct, and in part support the ecclesiastics who would be used in America."

NOTE C on American Catholics

The American revolution, by separating the interest of the colonies from those of the mother country changes the relations that bound the Catholics of America with those who live on the English dominion. The unity of the present governments seems to require that those bonds be diminished and weakened by taking from the British ministry all influence over the subjects of the United States.

In the greater number of the colonies, there is no endowment, no fixed revenue, for the support of a clergy of whatever denomination; legislation, viewing this subject from the standpoint of a more general freedom, has been unwilling to make a public charge of a tax that should be only voluntary and private. Neither is there a college or public establishment where a Catholic ecclesiastic may receive necessary instruction. These are two equally essential points to be considered.

There are in France four establishments of English monks, the total revenues of which may amount to 50,000 or 60,000 livres. These monks are few. The want of subjects makes those who remain useless at least.

It is possible that the King of France, to please the Court of Rome, and to strengthen the bonds of friendship with the United States, would permit these establishments to train, instruct and in part support the ecclesiastics who would be used in America.

It would be expedient that one of the Bishops named by the Holy See should be a subject of the king, residing in France, in a position, always, to act in accordance with the Nuncio of His Holiness and the American minister, and to adopt with them the means of training the ecclesiastics, which might be agreeable to Congress and useful to American Catholics.²⁸

²⁷ PD, p. 12.

²⁸ PD, pp. 12-13.

From these three memoranda it is clear that a definite policy regarding the American Church had been decided upon between March and September, 1783. Cardinal Antonelli's concession that a foreigner might be chosen as head of the American Church was evidently being made capital of in Paris, and whoever originated the scheme, found in Franklin a willing tool in the project of subjecting his Catholic fellow-citizens to a foreign superior, nominated by French influence and residing in France. The Nuncio was not favorably disposed toward the suggestion that the property of the Anglo-Benedictine Congregation be confiscated for the purpose of educating priests for the American Mission.²⁹ Vergennes also saw the injustice of Franklin's proposal and intimated to the Nuncio that Talleyrand would be the proper official to consult in this aspect of the affair. By September, 1783, therefore, the French scheme was fully developed. Besides a French Vicar-Apostolic for the United States, with episcopal character, who would rule the Church here through a suffragan or Vicar-General, an American Seminary was to be erected in one of the seacoast towns of France, supported by the revenues of the English monastic establishments in France which were to be confiscated for this purpose. How much money would be necessary for the project would depend upon the number of priests needed in the United States. The Nuncio called on Talleyrand and a conference was agreed upon between Doria Pamphili, Talleyrand, and Vergennes at Versailles. The Prime Minister and the Bishop of Autun both showed themselves desirous of carrying out the American Seminary idea. Accordingly, the Nuncio was directed to ask at Rome for further information on the American mission, namely, the number of priests already in the states, and the number that was still needed for the Church there. The Nuncio intended also, he tells Antonelli, to ask Vergennes to inquire from de la Luzerne, then French Minister at New York, "and who is much esteemed and loved there," for information on these two points.

As we have seen, the American clergy, although ignorant up to this time of the intrigue, had already begun to create their own organization during the peace year (1783-1784). The Whitemarsh meeting of the clergy on June 27, 1783, had decided upon a Chapter Form of Government. Father John Lewis, the Vicar-General of the London Vicar-Apostolic up to the outbreak of the war, was the acknowledged head of the Church in the United States down to the General Chapter of the American Clergy, on November 6, 1783, when his nomination as Superior for the whole Mission was sent to Rome. News of the proceedings of the June meeting had no doubt been reported to the Nuncio, for his letter of September 1, 1783, as has been seen above, contains a rather emphatic suggestion that silence on the whole plan should be kept: "On the other hand, Your Eminence will deign to inform neither the ecclesiastic just mentioned [the Superior of the Mission in the United States] nor anyone else, with the exception of the Holy Father, of my negotiations with the Count de Vergennes, and with Monseigneur the Bishop of Autun, since it is question, as yet, of a mere project, of which it would not be well to speak before it be

²⁹ Cf. TAUNTON, *The English Black Monks*, Vol. ii, chapters xvii-xix, London, 1897.

realized, or developed sufficiently not to be frustrated by anyone who may regard the proposed establishment unfavorably."

There were, indeed, several quarters from which opposition might legitimately be expected. The English Benedictines in France had dwindled to a mere shadow of their former greatness, St. Edmund's Monastery, in Paris, for example, being reduced to such a state that during the latter half of the eighteenth century "it was seriously considered whether it would not be as well to disband the house altogether."⁴⁰ All the English religious houses in France were indeed to be swept away in the whirlwind of the French Revolution ten years later, their sequestration taking place on February 18, 1793, a few days after the declaration of war between England and France;⁴¹ but no religious order, with the great antiquity of the Anglo-Benedictine Congregation behind it, could acquiesce without a protest in the heartless project contained in Franklin's NOTE C to the Nuncio. There was a lack of generosity in the plan, if, as Taunton states, Benjamin Franklin during his stay in Paris (1776-1784), was a constant guest at St. Edmund's Monastery, in Paris.⁴² Another source of opposition was naturally the American Catholics themselves. Priests and people were thoroughly imbued with the spirit of independence—at that time more intense in American life than ever afterwards; and the proposal to place them under a "foreign prince or potentate," was obnoxious to a nation which had just forged its way to freedom, and at such awful cost. Whether the English Benedictines became aware of the Franklin proposal we do not know. Both Taunton and Ward are silent on the matter, and both had access to archives which should have contained documents on the subject, had it been discussed.

We know that the French Vicar-Apostolic project was first made known to Carroll through former English associates. Carroll expresses his great surprise in a letter to Plowden, dated September 15, 1784, that his old friend Dr. Franklin had become a party to the Nuncio's intrigue,⁴³ which, however, was not meeting with the success its leaders expected. On September 27, 1783, Antonelli wrote to the Papal Nuncio at Paris, telling him that the Holy Father, Pius VI (1775-1799), had greatly commended his zeal and sagacity in having obtained the active cooperation of Vergennes and Talleyrand "in this salutary work." He reminds the Nuncio that "this Holy Congregation does not withdraw from its original offer to assist in the support of a Vicar-Apostolic endowed with episcopal character, or of a bishop, if this should be preferred, whom it will be necessary to put at the head of the Catholics in the United States." Very wisely, Antonelli rejected "without further discussion" the Franklin project of suppressing the four monasteries of English Benedictines in France. Antonelli's letter of this date is one of the most interesting in this correspondence:

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, Vol. ii, p. 287.

⁴¹ WARD, *Down of the Catholic Revival in England*, Vol. ii, p. 78, London, 1909.

⁴² TAUNTON, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 285.

⁴³ SHERA, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 210, note.

[Rome], September 27, 1783.

Your Lordship has so well begun the great matter of a plan for missions in the provinces of the new republic of the United States of North America that I do not doubt that you will soon bring it to a most happy termination. The Holy Father, who has been informed of your action, has greatly commended your zeal, and your sagacity in having interested the Count of Vergennes and Monseigneur the bishop of Autun in this salutary work, the former, for his protection as worthy prime minister, the latter, for the subsistence of the new workers, in view of his ministry of ecclesiastical benefices in that kingdom. This Holy Congregation, however, does not withdraw from its original offer to assist in the support of the Vicar-Apostolic endowed with the episcopal character, or of a bishop, if this should be preferred, whom it will be necessary to put at the head of the Catholics in the United States.

Conformably with the judicious suggestions of Your Lordship, the following points should be established:

I. The proposition of Mr. Franklin, to suppress the four monasteries of English Benedictines that exist in France, should be rejected, without further discussion. Besides the odium that would be aroused in the nation, which would be highly displeasing to the pacific and generous spirit of His Most Christian Majesty, grievous injury would be done to the missions of England, if the four monasteries in question should be suppressed, since the English Benedictine congregation, which furnishes nearly forty missionaries who work for the good of souls in England, would be reduced to the one monastery that, with the four in France, constitutes the total number of the convents of that worthy congregation.

II. The Nuncio to France, as Your Lordship opportunely suggested to Mr. Franklin, should have the supervision of these American missions, as is the case with the Nuncio at Brussels for the missions of Holland, and he would come to an understanding with the minister of the United States at Paris, whenever it was necessary to act in accordance with him for the greater good of those missions. This arrangement would also be compatible with an agent of the Vicar-Apostolic, or of the Bishop to be established in the United States, at Paris, in the person of some French ecclesiastic, who, upon occasion, would act in concert with the minister of those States and with the nuncio. It is to be desired that, some day, this new republic may have a Catholic minister at Paris; but, in the present circumstances, in which the minister is heretical, possibly Presbyterian, or Non-Conformist, which are the dominant sects in those states, it would be desirable to have a French ecclesiastic in private correspondence with the head of that mission, saving always the formal correspondence between the nuncio and the minister.

III. It was suggested above, and is repeated now, that it appears very necessary to establish that the superior, who is to have jurisdiction over all the Catholics of the American Republic, be invested with the character of bishop, with the title of Vicar-Apostolic, or, if acceptable, that he be the bishop of a diocese in that country. He may take his title from any city in the provinces of that republic that may seem to be the one best adapted for his residence. As the greater number of Catholics are in Maryland and in Pennsylvania, it would appear that the residence should be established in one of these two states; but it will be better to determine this point according to what may be most satisfactory to the minister and to the states. There is no doubt

that all the missionaries should depend upon the Vicar-Apostolic, or bishop, and receive from him their powers and destination among the various stations, according to requirements. And, to that end, the Prelate will be invested with the most ample powers, as for instance, those of the first formula.

IV. As to the subjects to be chosen, for the vicariate-apostolic, or the episcopacy, as well as for missionaries, present conditions seem clearly to indicate that they should be taken from among the ecclesiastical subjects of His Most Christian Majesty. But if in time any native should be found available for the sacred ministry, there is no doubt that the Vicar or Bishop would be free to ordain him, and to employ him in the missions.

V. It would be most useful to establish a college for the sole benefit of these missionaries, at Nantes, St. Malo, l'Orient, or some other place, near the ocean; but it may be foreseen that the magnitude of the idea would make its realization difficult. It is clearly understood that Monseigneur d'Autun, by his favor, could overcome all obstacles; but great and expensive things, as would be the creation of a new college, should not be sought.

VI. Consideration might be given, therefore, to the idea of increasing to some extent the income of the Seminary of Foreign Missions, where ecclesiastics, already, are trained for the East Indies; or, better still, the Seminary of Saint Esprit, the ecclesiastics of which are destined to the missions of South America, at Cayenne and Guiana, imposing upon it the obligation of maintaining there, for the present, a reasonable number of ecclesiastics, to be sent under the suggested authority in America to the provinces of the United States. If, to begin, eight or ten missionaries are sent, besides the vicar, or bishop, this will provide sufficiently for the needs of the faithful in question, the number of whom is not precisely known to this Holy Congregation, which is also without exact information of the number of the old workers, who, for the greater part, were of the suppressed Society of Jesus; for, neither directly, nor through the Vicar-Apostolic of London, has news been received concerning those Catholics, of whom some information was sent to Your Lordship in the instruction of the 15th of January of the present year.

VII. If the number of workers suggested should prove to be insufficient, it will be time, then, to think of other means of study for a greater number of subjects, and it will be possible, even, if there be a desire to form a national clergy, to establish at the college of the Propaganda, here, two or three places for Americans, as has been done for so many nations of Asia, Africa, and Europe.

Your Lordship, however, who is better informed of the state of affairs, will know which of the points noted above should be communicated to the minister, and which not; upon this point, His Holiness and this Congregation repose on your known zeal and activity, of which there are so many exceptional proofs; and thanking Your Lordship for the letter which you enclosed from Monseigneur the Vicar-Apostolic of London, I remain, with all esteem, heartily yours. ⁴⁴

The hierarchal character of the French project as outlined by Antonelli was as follows: At the head of American ecclesiastical affairs would be the Papal Nuncio in Paris, who would, as Ordinary, act with the knowledge and understanding of the American minister in Paris, "whenever it was necessary

⁴⁴ PD, pp. 14-17.

to act in accordance with him for the greater good of those missions." Subordinate to the Nuncio would be a French Vicar-Apostolic or Bishop, with an official agent at Paris, who would act in concert with the American minister and with the Nuncio. Antonelli hoped that some day the new Republic might have a Catholic minister at Paris; but until that should occur, it would be best to have a French ecclesiastic act as agent for the American mission. Apart from this, there would always be, he explained, "the formal correspondence between the Nuncio and the minister." The third point in Antonelli's letter is quite significant: It is becoming more evident, in fact, it appears very necessary, to appoint a bishop for the United States, who should have his See in that country. Since the greater number of Catholics live in Maryland and in Pennsylvania, it would appear, he says, that the Bishop's See should be established in either one of these two states. Whoever is appointed, whether as bishop or as Vicar-Apostolic, should have episcopal jurisdiction over the Church in the states. The choice of an ecclesiastic to occupy this post is clearly indicated by present conditions—"he should be taken from among the ecclesiastical subjects of His Most Christian Majesty." Not only was the ecclesiastical head to be chosen, but the missionaries also for the Church in the new Republic, from among the French clergy. It might happen, in time, Antonelli adds, that if an American be found available for the sacred ministry, "there is no doubt that the Vicar or Bishop would be free to ordain him, and to employ him in the missions." It may be necessary for the reader's benefit to emphasize the fact that the ecclesiastic who thus describes the early American Church was not only a Cardinal but was also the Prefect of the Congregation which had for its purpose the propagation of the faith in non-Catholic lands. There were means at his disposal for a thorough acquaintance with the state of the American Church, but those means were seldom employed. The interest shown in the organization of the Church in the United States in these early years was mainly political and financial, and from this date down to the first Provincial Council of Baltimore in 1829, no impartial reader will be able to accuse the Roman authorities of accurate knowledge of American Catholic affairs in general or of American conditions, geographical and otherwise, in particular. The American clergy will be at the mercy of meddlers and at the mercy of ignorant chiefs in the Congregation to which they are obliged to look as to their superiors, until an Archbishop of Baltimore breaks the restraint the American clergy must have felt, and appeals directly to the Pope in a letter which lacks nothing in its indignation at the sad situation in which Roman curial ignorance had placed them.⁴

Antonelli's letter of September 27, 1783, must have been written with cognizance of the plans formulated by the American clergy. He persists,

⁴ Archbishop Neale to Pope Pius VII, Georgetown, March 6, 1817. Cf. *SHERA, op. cit.*, Vol. iii, p. 34. Cf. Marechal's *Report of 1818* in the *CHR*, Vol. i, pp. 439-453. An interesting side-light on the situation will be found in S. B. Monsu (of telegraph fame), *Foreign Conspiracy against the Liberty of the United States*, p. 141. New York, 1835; it was published originally under the pen-name "Brutus" in the *New York Observer* (1834-1835).

however, in the American Seminary project. He directs the Nuncio's attention to the idea of combining the Seminary project with either the Seminary of Foreign Missions or the Seminary of the Holy Ghost in Paris. If the income of either of these establishments was to be augmented for the purpose by Talleyrand, they could be required to furnish a certain number of missionaries for the missions in the United States. Eight or ten missionaries, he thinks, would be a sufficient number to send to the United States; but of this he is not quite certain, because the number of Catholics in the United States "is not precisely known to this Holy Congregation, which is also without exact information of the number of the old workers." Later on, he deems, there might be room for a national American College at Rome, for the formation of a national clergy.

On December 15, 1783, Franklin wrote to Vergennes that the delay in the spiritual organization of the American Church was causing him some concern:

I understand that the Bishop or spiritual person who superintends or governs the Roman Catholic clergy in the United States of America resides in London, and is supposed to be under obligations to that Court and subject to be influenced by its Ministers. This gives me some uneasiness, and I cannot but wish that one should be appointed to that office who is of this nation and who may reside here among our friends. I beg Your Excellency to think a little of this matter and afford me your counsels upon it. ⁴⁶

"But for this positive evidence," says Shea, "we could scarcely believe that Dr. Franklin lent himself to a plan for treating his Catholic countrymen in this manner and helping a conspiracy to subject them not to a Superior chosen from among themselves, but to one nominated by the French Court and residing in France."⁴⁷ Franklin certainly had opportunities in Paris of learning that the Vicar-Apostolic of London had exercised no jurisdiction over the Church in America from the outbreak of the Revolution, and Bishop Talbot's refusal to recognize the American Church as part of his charge was too well known at the time to have been ignored by one so fortunately placed as Franklin. On receiving Franklin's letter, Vergennes made a memorandum, which shows that the Prime Minister was not altogether satisfied about the French Vicar-Apostolic plan, and that he was better acquainted with the situation than Franklin. "Mr. Franklin," he says, "represents that since the Bishop governing the Catholic Clergy in America resides in London, it is to our interest to name someone for that charge who could reside in the United States." Franklin had already consulted Archbishop de Cicé of Bordeaux on the Seminary subject, doubtless at the suggestion of Talleyrand, as we learn in a letter from de Cicé to Vergennes, dated December 27, 1783:

I regard it a duty, Count, to inform you of the proposition just made me by Mr. Franklin. The object is to secure to religion among the Catholics of the United States more order and facility in the number and choice of ministers necessary for them. I reasonably presume that in this matter Mr. Franklin is the interpreter of the wishes of his Catholic fellow-citizens. He seems to

⁴⁶ *ACHS Researches*, Vol. xi, p. 190.

⁴⁷ *Op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 215.

desire that to attain more securely what they propose, they should have in France a titled ecclesiastic, appointed to provide for the wants of the Church."⁴³

The truth is that Franklin was not only acting blindly in the whole affair, but was proceeding without the knowledge of the Catholic leaders in the new Republic. Certainly his wishes regarding the chief pastor of the flock in the United States were at variance with those of the American clergy, as evidenced in the Whitmarsh meeting of 1783-1784. The Archbishop of Bordeaux, while not a party to the enterprise, was brought into the affair, on account of the Bordeaux American Seminary scheme, of which the correspondence speaks often during these two years. Cicé acted very cautiously, albeit generously, in the matter. Among the *Franklin MSS.* at the Library of Congress (fol. 2617), there is a letter from the Archbishop of Bordeaux to Franklin, assuring him of his eagerness to second the worthy efforts of Talleyrand and the American minister to supply the American Mission with priests, but asking for more detailed information before he gave his consent to the Bordeaux project.⁴⁴

It would appear, from a letter of Antonelli to Doria Pamphili, of June 9, 1784, that Talleyrand had first made the proposition that one of the Seminaries in Bordeaux be used for the American Seminary project.

Meanwhile Vergennes' commission to Luzerne had not been neglected. That worthy French Catholic gentleman had consulted with the leaders of the American Republic and on January 31, 1784, he wrote to Vergennes from Annapolis, stating that while Congress did not wish to take any action in the matter which was beyond its competency, the delegates had assured him that a Catholic bishop would be very well received. That part of the letter which touches on the subject is as follows:

Monseigneur the Apostolic Nuncio has made some propositions in the name of His Holiness to Doctor Franklin in regard to the sending of a Bishop or a Vicar-Apostolic whom the Holy Father desires to place over the Roman Catholic Churches of this continent. The Congress has respectfully welcomed that overture; it has been unable, however, to take action in this matter, which is not of the competency of Congress. It is a matter that concerns the Catholics alone; and the delegates who have spoken to me on the subject have assured me that a Catholic bishop would be very well received in the state of Pennsylvania and much more so in Maryland, where there are many Catholics, providing the prelate carefully avoided to assume any temporal jurisdiction or authority. The Congress, in general, would be pleased at the residence of a prelate, who by conferring the sacrament of Holy Orders on the priests of these parts, would relieve them of the necessity of receiving it in London or in Quebec, as has been done in the past. Some of the delegates even believe that a Catholic bishop would not refuse to confer Holy Orders on the Anglican ministers of America, who, until now, have been obliged to procure their ordination at London; but this practice does not seem to me to be compatible to the profession that those who receive Holy Orders must make or with the examination that they must undergo. The State

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 216.

⁴⁴ Cf. *ACHS Researches*, Vol. xxvii (1910), p. 345.

Legislatures and Congress refrain from entangling themselves with religious matters.⁴⁰

This letter was no doubt communicated at once to the Nuncio, who probably sent it to Propaganda. On May 11, 1784, as we read in the *Secret Journals of Congress*, one of the resolutions passed was to the effect that Dr. Franklin be requested to notify the Nuncio at Paris of the American policy of non-interference in religious affairs:

Resolved, That Doctor Franklin be desired to notify the apostolic nuncio at Versailles, that Congress will always be pleased to testify their respect to his sovereign and state; but that the subject of his application to Doctor Franklin, being purely spiritual, is without the jurisdiction and powers of Congress, who have no authority to permit or refuse it, these powers being reserved to the several states individually.⁴¹

This resolution could not have reached Franklin before the end of the summer, but the shrewd American Minister had already reached the same conclusion. Antonelli, likewise, was beginning to see the wisdom of appointing one of the American missionaries. Writing to Luzerne, under date of May 12, 1784, he states that the Sacred Congregation desires full information of the condition of the Church in the United States. (The four points of information asked for are those which Father Carroll eventually answers on March 1, 1785, in his *Relation*)—

Before the American revolution, the Catholics and missionaries of those states, in what concerns religion, were under the vigilance and direction of the Vicar-Apostolic residing in London. That revolution having separated the interest of the United States from those of England, and having entirely changed the government of those states, the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda has seen the necessity of taking other measures for the government of these missions; hence, Monseigneur, the Archbishop of Selesia, Apostolic Nuncio at Paris, was charged by this Congregation to make on that subject to the Congress of the United States some proposition, not less useful to religion and to the spiritual assistance of the Catholics than acceptable to the government of those States.

Monseigneur the Nuncio mentioned the matter to Mr. Franklin, who, however, answered that, having seriously reflected on it he considered it absolutely useless to refer the question to the Congress, which, by its constitutions and faculties, could not, and should not, entangle itself in ecclesiastical affairs, and consequently, that it was in the power of the Court of Rome to take all measures that might be of advantage to the Catholics in America, without offending the constitutions. After receiving this answer, the Congregation, by order of His Holiness, instructed Monseigneur the Nuncio to agree with the ministers of His Most Christian Majesty, and with the minister of the United States, upon the most desirable means of giving to the missions of North America the stability and development of which they might be capable.

His Most Christian Majesty having wished, on such an occasion, to give a new proof of his piety and of the interest that he takes in the preservation and extension of the Catholic religion in all parts of the world, found no difficulty

⁴⁰ PD, pp. 19-20.

⁴¹ Vol iii, p. 493. Boston, 1821.

in agreeing to a plan that is no less useful to the Catholics of the United States than to the government of those provinces; but, to establish a stable condition of things, and to forestall all the objections and difficulties that might present themselves in its realization, it is necessary to have certain information that may make it possible to compass that object.

1st. To have exact knowledge of the conduct and capacities of the ecclesiastics and missionaries who are in the various provinces of North America; which one of them would be the most worthy, and the most acceptable to the assembly of those provinces, to be created Bishop in *partibus* and invested with the character of vicar-apostolic, considering that it will be desirable to fix the residence in that province in which there is the greatest number of Catholics.

2d. If there be among those ecclesiastics a native of the country who may be among the most worthy, in equality of merits, he would be preferred to any of another nationality; and whenever the provinces would be in lack of missionaries, a Frenchman will be sent to establish himself there, residing in the province suggested above.

3d. To know the number of the ecclesiastics and missionaries, as, also, that of the Catholics in the different provinces and their area, assuming that the greater number of them is to be found in Pennsylvania and Maryland. It would be well, however, to know the same in regard to the other provinces.

4th. To know if there be schools in those provinces, where the Latin language may be learnt, and where those youths who wish to prepare for the ecclesiastic state may have studied the humanities before repairing to France or to Rome for the study of philosophy and of theology.¹²

On this same date, May 12, 1784, the Nuncio also wrote to Luzerne, at New York, asking him to assist Propaganda in ascertaining full knowledge of the state of affairs in the Church of the United States. He incloses a letter which he has drawn up by order of Propaganda, which he begs Luzerne to deliver "to one of the oldest missionaries of those provinces." He does not touch in this inclosed letter on the subject of the Bishop Vicar-Apostolic or on the manner of his selection, but he adds that "the ex-Jesuit, Mr. Carroll of Maryland, has been spoken of to me with eulogy, this Carroll being the same who was educated at St. Omer, and who, in 1776, was sent by the Congress to Canada, with Mr. Franklin and other commissioners. I hope that Your Lordship will be pleased to give me information concerning him, and will let me know whether you consider him worthy to be named bishop in *partibus* and vicar-apostolic."¹³

Shea intimates that this came about through the English Jesuits, who had become aware of the French intrigue, and he states that Plowden, Carroll's great friend, on hearing of the intrigue, wrote at once to Franklin to dissuade the American minister from the French scheme. Fathers Sewall and Mattingly, natives of Maryland, were then in England, and they added their protests to that of Plowden, explaining to Franklin that out of respect and consideration for the missionaries then in the United States no appointment should be made without their participation and consent. Plowden states this to Carroll in a letter dated September 2, 1784. It is not certain that this intervention

¹² PD, pp. 20-22.

¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 22-23.

preceded the letter of the Nuncio to Luzerne of May 12, 1784, but from this time on the French scheme was doomed. Franklin's eyes were opened, says Shea, and as he knew John Carroll personally, "he must have felt not a little chagrined to find himself made even indirectly the medium of impeaching the loyalty of the Carrolls and other patriotic American Catholics, priests and laymen. It is certain that he at once determined that sound policy required him to favor the appointment of an American missionary as Superior of the Catholics in the United States, and he certainly from this time exerted all his influence to press the appointment of Rev. Mr. Carroll, to whose qualifications he could bring the testimony of personal knowledge and daily intercourse for a considerable period."⁴⁴

Meanwhile, the project was dragging itself tediously to an end. On May 17, 1784, Doria Pamphili wrote to Antonelli (referring to his letter of April 26), stating that, on May 3, a conference was held at Versailles on the very important matter of the government of the missions in the provinces of the new Republic of the United States of North America, with Vergennes, Talleyrand, and himself present. The Prime Minister read Luzerne's dispatch from Annapolis of January 31, 1784. The Nuncio gave an abstract of His Eminence's letter of September 27, 1783. The chief matter discussed at the conference was the supply of the clergy for the American missions. It was decided that the Nuncio should send two letters; one to Luzerne and the other to one of the missionaries in America (those mentioned above, May 12, 1784), asking for information on the needs of the Church in the United States. The place to educate the students for the American Missions was also discussed. Paris, it was decided, would not be desirable, since only philosophy, canon and civil law, and theology were taught in the Seminaries there. The students would need a college education before beginning these studies, and for this purpose Talleyrand suggested that the Archbishop of Bordeaux, an intimate friend of the Bishop of Autun, should be asked to arrange for the reception of these students in one of the Seminaries in Bordeaux.

Since Mr. Franklin had spoken to him of the merits and good reputation of Father Carroll, the Nuncio hopes that the Holy See will be pleased to hear this, and he avers that Franklin and many members of Congress would welcome Carroll's appointment to the vicariate to be established in America.

The letter which the Nuncio inclosed in his dispatch to Luzerne, on May 12, 1784, addressed to "one of the missionaries living in America," was as follows:

The interests of religion requiring that new information be had of the missions that are established in the United States of North America, the Congregation of the Propaganda has ordered me to ask you for detailed information of the present conditions of those missions. I beg of you to let me know, at the same time, what number of missionaries would be necessary for the service of those stations and to secure spiritual assistance to the Catholic subjects of the United States; which are the provinces where there are Catholics, and where the greatest number of Catholics are to be found, and lastly, whether there be, among the natives of that country, subjects available

⁴⁴ *Op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 216-218.

to receive Holy Orders and to exercise the functions of a missionary. I will be very thankful to you, personally, for the precision and celerity with which you may be kind enough to procure and to forward this information for me. ⁴⁶

Luzerne had probably left for France when the letter arrived, and the chargé d'affaires, Marbois, informed Reyneval, Vergennes' secretary, on August 15, 1784, that he had sent the letter to Mr. Charles Carroll, asking him to give it to the oldest missionary. Shea says that this letter was addressed by the Nuncio to the Rev. John Carroll.⁴⁷ This is no doubt incorrect. Mr. Charles Carroll was asked by Marbois to give it to the oldest missionary and he relieved himself of responsibility in the matter by sending it to his cousin, Father Carroll. Father Carroll was not the oldest missionary, nor was he the Superior of the clergy at that time, but he was known to Franklin, and his reply would probably have greater weight with that statesman in the matter under consideration. On May 31, 1784, the Nuncio informed Antonelli that he had sent to Vergennes copies of the two letters of May 12, one to Luzerne and one to the oldest missionary.

On June 9, 1784, the whole matter was brought to an abrupt close by the action of the Holy See in appointing John Carroll "head of the missions in the provinces of the new Republic of the United States of North America." This action had a double effect: that of officially ending the jurisdiction of the Vicar-Apostolic of London over the Catholics in the former English Colonies, and that of giving to the Church in the United States its own autonomy under the jurisdiction of Propaganda. We have for this date, June 9, 1784, a letter from Antonelli to the Nuncio, which states that John Carroll had been appointed Prefect-Apostolic of the United States on that day, and refers to the fact that prior to the Nuncio's dispatch of May 17, 1784, the Congregation of Propaganda had received the Petition from the priests in America in which they requested that Father Lewis should be constituted their Superior. Antonelli inclosed copies of these letters for the Nuncio's perusal, and pointed out that Carroll's name is in the last place among the nominees sent by the American missionaries. "This fact shows," he says, "that Carroll has not cooperated with the earnest solicitation of Mr. Franklin in his behalf, and, consequently, it has helped to give him the preference over Lowis [*sic*], who, moreover, being 64 years of age, as the letters in question show, would seem to deserve a rest. We are not informed of the age of Carroll [he was then 49 years old], but it may be assumed to be a much more vigorous one than that of Lowis [*sic*] since he is named last in the petition."⁴⁸

A second letter of this same date, June 9, 1784, inclosed in the one to the Nuncio and addressed to Father Carroll, which the new Superior received on November 26, 1784, announced officially to the Church in America the decision reached by the Holy See:

⁴⁶ PD, pp. 27-28.

⁴⁷ *Op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 221.

⁴⁸ PD, p. 30.

Rome, June 9, 1784.

Very Rev. Sir:

In order to preserve and defend Catholicity in the Thirteen United States of North America, the Supreme Pontiff of the Church, Pius VI, and this Sacred Congregation have thought it extremely proper to designate a pastor who should, permanently and independently of any ecclesiastical power, except the same Sacred Congregation, attend to the spiritual necessities of the Catholic flock. In the appointment of such a pastor, the Sacred Congregation would have readily cast its eyes on the Rev. John Lewis if his advanced age and the labors he has already undergone in the vineyard of the Lord, had not deterred it from imposing on him a new and very heavy burden; for he seems to require repose rather than arduous labor. As then, Rev. Sir, you have given conspicuous proofs of piety and zeal, and it is known that your appointment will please and gratify many members of that republic, and especially Mr. Franklin, the eminent individual who represents the same republic at the court of the Most Christian King, the Sacred Congregation, with the approbation of his Holiness, has appointed you Superior of the Mission in the thirteen United States of North America, and has communicated to you the faculties, which are necessary to the discharge of that office; faculties which are also communicated to the other priests of the same States, except the administration of confirmation, which is reserved for you alone, as the enclosed documents will show.

These arrangements are meant to be only temporary. For it is the intention of his Holiness soon to charge a Vicar-Apostolic, invested with the title and character of bishop, with the care of those states, that he may attend to ordination and other episcopal functions. But, to accomplish this design, it is of great importance that we should be made acquainted with the state of the orthodox religion in those thirteen states. Therefore we request you to forward to us, as soon as possible, a correct report, stating carefully the number of Catholics in each state; what is their condition, their piety and what abuses exist; also how many missionary priests labor now in this vineyard of the Lord; what are their qualifications, their zeal, their mode of support. For though the Sacred Congregation wish not to meddle with temporal things, it is important for the establishment of laborers, that we should know what are the ecclesiastical revenues, if any there are, and it is believed there are some. In the meantime for fear the want of missionaries should deprive the Catholics of spiritual assistance, it has been resolved to invite hither two youths from the states of Maryland and Pennsylvania, to educate them at the expense of the Sacred Congregation in the Urban College; they will afterwards, on returning to their country, be substitutes in the mission. We leave to your solicitude the care of selecting and sending them. You will make choice of those who have more promising talents and a good constitution, who are not less than twelve, nor more than fifteen years of age; who by their proficiency in the sanctuary may give great hopes of themselves. You may address them to the excellent archbishop of Seleucia, Apostolic Nuncio at Paris, who is informed of their coming. If the young men selected are unable to defray the expenses of the voyage, the Sacred Congregation will provide for them; we even wish to be informed by you frankly and accurately of the necessary traveling expenses, to serve as a rule for the future. Such are the things I had to signify to you; and whilst I am confident you will discharge the office committed to you with all zeal, solicitude and fidelity, and more than

answer the high opinion we have formed of you, I pray God that he may grant you all peace and happiness.

L. Card Antonelli,
Prefect.

Stephen Borgia,
Secretary.⁴⁸

Father Carroll received the news of his appointment from several sources, namely—a) August 20, 1784, Father Thorpe's letter of June 9, from Rome; b) September 17-18, 1784, Father Charles Plowden's letter of July 3, from England; c) November 7-8, 1784, Barbé de Marbois' letter of October 27, from New York; d) November 26, 1784, Cardinal Antonelli's letter of June 9, from Rome.

(a) Father Thorpe's letter of June 9 announced his appointment, the nature of the faculties imparted by Propaganda, particularly the power of administering Confirmation, and stated that as soon as the necessary information of the state of the Church in America reached Propaganda, the Holy See would promote him to the dignity and character of a Bishop. This letter Carroll presented to his brethren at the Whitemarsh Chapter on October 11, 1784. The Chapter passed three important resolutions based upon the decision that a Superior in *spiritualibus* was adequate "to the present exigencies of religion in this country": (1) That a Bishop was unnecessary; (2) that if one be sent [*i. e.*, not elected by themselves], he should not be entitled to support from the clergy estates; (3) that a Committee of Three [Fathers Diderick, Matthews, and Mosley] be empowered to send a *Memorial* to Rome against the appointment of a Bishop.⁴⁹ This *Memorial* was prepared at once; and on December 9, 1784, Father Bernard Diderick wrote to Carroll as follows:

Port Tobacco, December 9, 1784.

Rev. Sir: We send you a copy of the letter we have drawn up to send to Rome. We hope it will not be disagreeable to you, as your intended promotion seemed to give you much uneasiness. We should be happy, in case of a bishop's being appointed here, that you should be the person, as we have not any objection to your person and qualities. But as we look upon it to be unnecessary, and hurtful to the good of religion, we have sent this letter according to what was determined in chapter.

We are, with due respect, Rev. Sir,

Your most obed't and humble servants,
BERNARD DIDERICK,
IGNATIUS MATTHEWS.⁵⁰

The *Memorial* was as follows:

Most Holy Father:

Of the twenty-two secular priests living in the thirteen United States of North America, six were appointed a few months ago to deliberate together upon the welfare of the Catholics in this part of the world. Having assembled for this purpose, they expressed the opinion that there is not the least

⁴⁸ *SHRA, op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 243-245.

⁴⁹ *HUGHES, op. cit.*, Documents, Vol. ii, p. 633.

⁵⁰ *United States Catholic Magazine*, Vol. iii, p. 797.

necessity for a bishop in this country, because there is no institution as yet for the education of youth and their subsequent preparation for holy orders. I, Bernard Diderick, have been requested by the committee to notify your holiness of this sentiment, and to acquaint you also with the following circumstances:

1. The majority of the Protestant population here are averse to a Roman Catholic prelate, and for this reason the episcopal office if introduced would most likely awaken their jealousy against us.

2. We are not able to support a bishop in a manner becoming his station, and at the same time to supply the necessary wants of our fellow laborers in the ministry; moreover, the Catholics cannot be induced to aid us with their means in effecting this object.

3. Were it even admitted that the two points just mentioned would present no difficulty, we are entirely at a loss to see how the greater number of missionaries, whose cooperation would be so very desirable in this immense region, could be furnished with the means of passing to this country.

We therefore humbly entreat your holiness not to persist in the design of conferring the episcopal dignity upon any individual in these parts, unless the necessary provision be made in some other quarter for his support. Should your holiness entertain a different view, it would be a source of much affliction to us, while at the same time we are convinced that it will be much more detrimental than otherwise to the interest of religion; for, as it has pleased your holiness to appoint one of our body to administer confirmation, consecrate altar-stones, bless the holy oils, and grant dispensations in the prohibited degrees, this appointment is equally advantageous for the good of religion.⁴¹

Carroll's sentiments on the *Memorial* are well expressed in a letter to Father Thorpe, dated February 17, 1785, copied from the original brouillon in the Baltimore Archives, which follows in its chronological place in this series of documents on the question.

(b) Father Charles Plowden's letter of July 3, 1784, which Carroll answered on September 18, 1784. (He mentions having received the news already from Father Thomas Talbot, the Procurator of the dissolved English Jesuit Province). "I do assure you, dear Charles," he wrote, "that nothing personal to myself, excepting the dissolution of the Society, ever gave me so much concern. And, if a meeting of our gentlemen to be held on the 9th of October agree in thinking that I can decline the intended office without grievous inconvenience, I shall certainly do so."⁴²

(c) The letter of Barbé de Marbois, French Chargé d'Affaires, at New York, dated October 27, 1784, reached Carroll on November 8. "I congratulate myself," Marbois says, "in being one of the first to assure you that this choice will give general satisfaction." Accompanying the letter was the dispatch from Cardinal Antonelli to "Mr. John Carroll, Superior of the Missions in the thirteen United States of North America," authorizing him to publish the Jubilee of 1775-1776, which was specially extended to the

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 797-798.

⁴² HUGHES, *op. cit.*, Documents, Vol. ii, pp. 632-633.

United States. The proclamation of this Jubilee was the first official act of the new Superior.

(d) The official documents of his election to the Superiorship sent by Cardinal Antonelli on June 9, reached him on November 26, 1784. Cardinal Antonelli's letter, as given above, emphasized the one point in the official decree of appointment which gave Father Carroll most concern, namely, the nature and the extent of his dependence on Propaganda.

Shea has summed up the effect of this letter in the following paragraph:

The action of the Holy See had given the Catholics in the United States a separate organization; but among priests and people who had just emerged from the oppressed condition so long maintained by the penal laws, the temporary tenure of the Prefect, his absolute dependence on the Propaganda, and the extremely limited powers given him, were the source of much uneasiness.⁴³

No one felt more uneasy over the embarrassing situation caused by his appointment than Father Carroll himself. We have seen how decided his views were from the beginning on the question of having the American Church under what he and others called "Foreign domination." The appointment was not at all to his liking. "He had a decided repugnance to accept any position, and especially one merely at their pleasure, from the Congregation de Propaganda Fide; to accept it hampered by restrictions and little power for good was a step from which he shrank." The action taken by the Chapter in October, 1784, left him free to decline the appointment. Our only means of following his deliberations on the question of acceptance is in his correspondence with his fellow priests, as a result of a Circular he issued about this time to the clergy announcing his appointment and asking for their guidance in the matter. This circular contained the statement:

Nothing but the present extreme necessity of some spiritual powers here, could induce me to act under a commission, which may produce, if long continued, and it should become public, the most dangerous jealousy.⁴⁴

Some of this correspondence has survived, and in a special manner, the letters of his two friends of Philadelphia, Fathers Molyneux and Farmer, are important, for they undoubtedly had a great share in his decision. Father Molyneux had been in correspondence with Carroll all through the year 1784, owing to the Wharton-Carroll controversy, and had been instrumental in securing important data from the library of James Logan for Carroll's reply to the apostate. Shortly after Father Thorpe's letter had become known to the clergy, Father Molyneux wrote to Carroll, September 18, 1784, telling him of the great joy he experienced in learning that the Holy See had chosen Carroll for the post. "It is our humble opinion," he wrote, "that you should not hesitate one moment in giving your consent. *In negotio tanti momenti digitus Dei, haud dubium est.* We shall henceforth esteem it our duty daily to remember you *ad altare*. May God grant us all grace to be ever thankful, and by our lives and conversation show that we are not undeserving." It has

⁴³ *Op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 245-264.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 251, note.

been my uniform opinion that no one was so fit for the sacred character."²² This sentiment he reiterates in letters dated from Philadelphia, November 18, November 25, and December 7, 1784. "A refusal on your part," he writes, "or an objection on that of any of our gentlemen [the ex-Jesuits] might prove fatal to their fortune and existence in this country, and perhaps so to the cause of religion." Father Farmer to whom he showed his letters urged Carroll to reply at once to Propaganda, accepting the post.

In the Baltimore Archives (Case 9A-F1) there is the rough sketch of a circular, dated January 12, 1785, which Carroll issued regarding the Jubilee of 1775-1776. "The commencement of this grant is to date from November 28, 1784, and it is to be in force till November 28, 1785. A commission was sent me at the same time to publish it in all the countries subject to these states." At the end of this letter is the announcement that, until "I have better opportunity of conversing with the several gentlemen, to fix a general and equitable rule for keeping lent for all the different Congregations, I request each of you to make such regulations (for this year) for those under your charge, as you shall in prudence think proper." This is the language of a Superior. Father Carroll had evidently concluded to accept the Prefectship-Apostolic by this time, but before doing so he decided to place the whole affair with its proper light before the authorities at Rome. A long letter, written on February 14, 1785, to his friend Father Thorpe at Rome, is a summary of the ecclesiastical situation created by his appointment. The rough draft of the *Letter*, with many erasures and corrections, is in the *Baltimore Archives* (Case 9A-F1.) It is here printed for the first time in full; Shea has only used excerpts from it:

Maryland, near Georgetown, Feb. 17, 1785

The official information of the advices sent by you June 9th, 1784, was only received Nov. 26th. I did myself the honour of writing to you on the subject, immediately after receiving your letter, which was about the 20th of August, and of thanking you most cordially for your active and successful endeavours to render service to this country. I say successful, not because your partiality, as I presume, joined to that of my old and cheerful friend Dr. Franklin suggested me to the consideration of his Holiness; but because you have obtained some form of spiritual government to be adopted for us. It is not indeed quite such as we wish; and it cannot continue long in its present form. You well know, that in our free and jealous government, where Catholics are admitted into all public councils equally with the professors of any other Religion, it will never be suffered that their Ecclesiastical Superior (be he a Bishop or Prefect-Apostolic), receive his appointment from a foreign State, and only hold it at the discretion of a foreign tribunal or congregation. If even the present temper, or inattention of our Executive, and legislative bodies were to overlook it for this and perhaps a few more instances, still ought we not to acquiesce and rest quiet in actual enjoyment; for the consequence, sooner or later, would certainly be, that some malicious or jealous-minded person would raise a spirit against us, and under pretence of rescuing the State from foreign influence, and dependence, strip us per-

²² USCM, Vol. iii, p. 376-379.

haps of our common civil rights. For these reasons, every thinking man amongst us is convinced, that we neither must request or admit any other foreign interference than such, as being essential to our religion, is implied in the acknowledgment of the Bishop of Rome, by divine appointment, head of the universal Church; and the See of St. Peter being the center of ecclesiastical unity.

I am well aware that these suggestions will sound ungrateful at Rome, and that the mention of them from us will be perhaps imputed by some of the officers of the propaganda to a remaining spirit of Jesuitism; but I own to you, that tho' I wish to treat with them upon terms of sincere unanimity and cordial concurrence in all matters tending to the service of Religion, yet I do not feel myself disposed to sacrifice to the fear of giving offence the permanent interests of Religion. I mean candidly and respectfully to state our present situation; the spirit of our people; and the sentiments of the R. Catholics, the principal of whom are ready and desirous to transmit to Rome their opinion on the probable consequences of such a spiritual government, as is laid down in my dispatches from yr city. Whether I shall transmit their opinion under their own signature, I am yet uncertain; I would wish to avoid giving the Congregation, or any other person the smallest reason to suspect a cabal to defeat their measures; and if plain and honest representation will not succeed with them, I should fear the effects of intemperate obstinacy.

That you may judge of these matters yourself, I must inform you, that my dispatches contained, 1st decree of the Congn. of the Propgda., appointing me Superior of the Missions in the Thirteen U. States, *ad suum beneplacitum . . . cum auctore ea exercendi, quae ad earundem Missionum regimen pertinent, ad proscriptum decretorum sacrae Congnis. et facultatum eidem [mihi] concessarum et, non alias nec alio modo.* 2-ly An order from his Holiness, empowering me to administer Confirmation. 3-ly A letter from Cardl. Antonelli, advising that His Holiness has extended to these States the Jubilee of 1776. 4-ly Another letter from him and one likewise from the Nuncio at Paris, desiring me to send two youths to be educated in the College of the Propgda. 5-ly In the same letter Cardl. Antonelli wishes to know the number of our Clergy, and the amount of their incomes: for tho' the Congregation means not to meddle in temporalibus, yet conceiving and believing there are Church possessions here, it is proper for them to know how many Clergymen can be maintained from them. 6-ly He further informs that his Holiness means hereafter to appoint a Bishop Vicar-apostolic; but neither insinuates when or whom. 7-ly In the faculties sent me, which with respect to matrimonial dispensations, are too much restricted, for our exigencies. I am particularly charged to grant no powers or faculties to any who may come into this country, but those quos sacra Congregao. destinaverit et approbaverit. Thus you see the outlines of our future Ecclesiastical government, as it is planned at Rome.

Our objections to it are—1st We conceive our situation no longer as that of missionaries; and the Ecclesiastical constitution here no longer as that of a mission. By acquiring civil and religious rights in common with other Christians, we are become a national Catholic Clergy; Colleges are now erecting for giving general and liberal education; these Colleges are open, both to masters and scholars of every religious denomination; and as we have every reason to believe, that amongst the youth trained in these different

Colleges, there will be frequently some inclined to the Ecclesiastical State we Catholics propose instituting a Seminary to form them to the virtues of their future state, and to instruct them in Divinity. Thus we shall in a few years, with the blessing of providence, be able to supply this country with labourers in the Lord's vineyard, and keep up a succession, if we are indulged in a Bishop. We are not in immediate want of one, and it will be more agreeable to many of my Brethren not to have any yet appointed; but whenever the time for it comes, we conceive that it will be more advantageous to Religion and less liable to give offence that he be an ordinary Bishop, and not a Vicar-Apostolic, and be chosen and presented to his Holiness by the American Cath. Clergy. 2-ly For two reasons we think it improper to be subject in our Ecclesiastical government to the Propaganda: the first is, that not being missionaries, we conceive ourselves, not a proper object of their institutions; and the second is, that tho' our free and tolerant forms of Government (in Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania) admit us to equal civil rights with other Christians, yet the leading men in our respective States often express a jealousy of any foreign jurisdiction; and surely will be more offended without submitting to it in matters not essential to our faith. I hope they will never object to our depending on the Pope in things purely spiritual; but I am sure there are men, at least in this State, who would blow up a flame of animosity against us, if they suspected that we were to be so much under the government of any Congn. at Rome, as to receive our Superior from it, commissioned only during their good will; and that this Superior was restricted from employing any Clergyman here, but such as that Congregation should direct. I dread so much the consequences of its being known that this last direction was ever given, that I have not thought it proper to mention it to several of my Brethren.

With respect to sending two youths, I shall inform Propaganda that it would surely be very acceptable to have children educated gratis in so religious a seminary; and very acceptable to us all to have a succession of ministers of the altar thus provided for: but, as I suppose, they will not receive any into their College, but such as shall afterwards be subject to their government; and it being yet uncertain what effect my representations may produce, I shall delay that measure till further information.

I shall in the meantime request permission to give faculties to other Clergymen, than those sent by the Propgda., of whose virtue and talents I shall have sufficient documents. For want of this power, the Catholics in the Jerseys, N. Y., the great Western Country, bordering on the lakes, and the Ohio, Wabash, and Mississippi (to say nothing of many in the N. England States and Carolinas) are entirely destitute of spiritual succours. The Catholics in some of these Settlements, have been at the expence of paying the passage of some Irish Franciscans, providing for their subsistence, and in erecting places of worship. These men have brought good testimonials; but I am precluded from giving them any spiritual powers.

I should deem it a singular happiness to have an opportunity of conferring with a person of your experience of the air of Rome, before these representations are given in. But our distance is so great, that I must act according to the best of my own and Brethren's judgment, and commit all I can to your prudent management. At a meeting of some of us last autumn, it was ordered that £. St. 20-0-0 should be remitted to you as a feeble acknowledgement of our sense of your services and to defray your expence of attendance, etc.

Mr. Ashton, who is chosen to be our Manager general, either has or soon will transmit the necessary orders for it. Tho', since my late appointment, I do not intermeddle in our temporal concerns, yet I shall not fail to suggest the propriety of fixing on you, as our agent, a permanent salary: it will be proportioned, not to your zeal and services, but to our poor ability. At the same meeting, but after I had left it thro' indisposition, a direction was given to Messrs. Diderick, Mosely, and Matthews to write you a letter (I believe likewise a Memorial to the Pope) against the appointment of a Bishop. I hear that this has displeased many of those absent from the meeting, and that it is not certain, whether the measure is to be carried into execution. Mr. Diderick has shown me a copy of his intended letter to you, of his Memorial, and of a letter to Cardl. Borromeo. He has no other introduction to write to this worthy Cardinal than the information communicated to me by our common friend Plowden, of his great worth and friendly disposition to you. I made objections to some parts of his letters; and I cannot tell as I mentioned before whether they will be sent. It is [a] matter of surprise to me that he was nominated to the commission of Three; he is truly a zealous, painstaking Clergyman; but not sufficiently prudent, and conversant in the world, or capable of conducting such a business with the circumspection necessary to be used by us towards our own Government, and the Congn. of the Propaganda.

My long letter must have tired you. But it has been so earnestly recommended to me to give you very minute intelligence, that I have ventured to trespass on your patience. I have two things more to request: 1st. that you would please to present us all, and myself in particular, to Cardl. Borromeo, as penetrated with a lively sense of his virtue, and earnestly suing for his good offices to the service of Religion in this Country, wherever they can be usefully employed. 2-ly that you would let Mr. Thayer know (for I hear from Plowden that he is at Paris, and corresponds with you) that I shall be happy in being favoured with an epistolary intercourse with him: and in confidence of your introduction, I shall probably write to him before I have your answer.

The little leisure I have lately had, has been taken up in writing and publishing an answer to Wharton's pamphlet, which was held up as unanswerable by our adversaries, whom the elegance of his language, and their ignorance in Religious controversy equally contributed to deceive. I have desired Mr. Talbot to transmit you a copy by the first opportunity. I doubt, I have not made my court to a certain party at Rome by my note on the destruction of the Society. Be pleased to charge with us all postage and other expences on our acct. A credit shall be placed in England for discharging them.

With perfect esteem,

I have the honour to be, Dr Sir,

etc. etc.

Mr. Thorpe.

The ease with which the French intrigue had progressed became clearer to Father Carroll through his correspondence with Father Plowden. On September 21, 1784, Father Plowden wrote a complete exposé of the whole project, and his letter contained the following important message:

Although I know you to be incapable of mistaking the right line of conduct upon this occasion, yet, I think it the part of a friend to send you whatever information I can obtain. My meaning is not to advise or instruct you, but only to enlarge your prospect. I must repeat that there are certainly some oblique views, most probably directed to the property of the American mission, and to the obtaining superiority over the missionaries. The note delivered to the nuncio proves their wishes to exclude every Jesuit from trust or honor, and equally betrays the policy of the French ministry ("the nation most friendly to congress"), who, by bringing forward a Frenchman, or perhaps an Irish-Frenchman, would use religion as an instrument to increase their own influence in America. Our friend Thorpe's memorial, delivered to the Pope, along with your petition, by Cardinal Borromeo, convinced the propaganda that the introduction of an alien would overthrow the mission. I wish you may quickly be turned into an ordinary from a bishop in partibus, and am persuaded the pope could not refuse you the powers, &c., if your election by your own clergy, were abetted by your provincial assembly. We wish you to be as free as the bishop of Quebec, or the new archbishop of Mohilow. I wish to know in what light the leading men in the states consider your appointment. If they are disposed to tolerate it, surely they would be more willing to admit a bishop only dependent on the holy see, than one who must be subject to the prefect and secretary of a congregation. If they can be brought to relish such a prelate, it is but one step more: you want not talents or spirit to take it, and all difficulties are at once removed. The business has been hitherto treated at Paris, with uncommon secrecy by the nuncio,

Mr. Thayer, who lives in Navarre college, wrote lately thus, to our friend Thorpe:

"With respect to the views of Rome upon America, all that I can tell you is that there is a treaty on foot to establish a vicar-apostolic for the thirteen states, which treaty, I suppose, is near conclusion. I know not what the Americans will think of this plan, whether they would fear a too great dependance on Rome. This I know, that any English priests whom I have the honor to know here, think that apostolic vicars are the ruin of Catholicity in England, and that bishops properly established, would be the fit instruments of building a solid edifice, both there and in America." Make your own comments, my dear friend, on this extract, substitute a less violent word to ruin, and we shall easily agree with the writer. He is noticed by the archbishop of Paris and other dignified clergymen of the greatest merit, and much commended by the superior of Navarre college, in whose house he lives gratis. He appears to be sincere, and zealous for the promotion of religion in America, and we hope he will not be misled, &c.

If your friends here were better informed of your concerns, they might occasionally yield you service. Upon the first rumor that a vicar-apostolic was to be appointed, I prevailed upon Mr. Hoskins to write to Dr. Franklin to expose to him the degree of respect and consideration due to the missionaries now in America, and to desire that no proposals might be admitted without the participation and consent of you in particular, of the other missionaries, and the principal Catholic gentry in the country. At Mr. Thorpe's desire, the same has been written to him by Messrs. N. Sewell and Mattingly, with other information relative to the origin and actual state of the American missions. Mr. Thorpe is all alive in your service; and wishes that his endeavors

may be useful to the common cause, and approved by you. The Romans have got scent of your promotion, and according to their custom have strangely distorted the whole business, even your name. They bring in the French king to figure in it, and talk of congress and your provincial assemblies as if they were so many conseils souverains in France."⁶⁶

This letter probably reached Father Carroll about the time of the *Memorial* of December, 1784. To this situation abroad was added the danger of dissension at home. The "famous triumvirate," as Father Molyneux called the anti-episcopal Committee, was apparently not in favor of Carroll. No doubt other factors of which we are nowadays unaware entered into his final decision to accept the Prefectship. "Since the prefecture," writes O'Gorman, "was expected to pave the way to some more satisfactory and permanent arrangement, and since, on the other hand, his refusal might result in the imposition of a foreigner as Prefect on the Catholics in America, Carroll yielded to the arguments of his fellow-priests and decided to take up the onerous office."⁶⁷

Father Carroll's acceptance of the Prefectship is contained in his *Letter* to Cardinal Antonelli, dated February 27, 1785. The rough draft of this *Letter* is in the *Baltimore Archives* (Case 9A-F1); an imperfect copy is among the *Shea Transcripts* at Georgetown University. The original, given here for the first time, has been photostated at Rome (*Propaganda Archives, America Centrale*, vol. 2, fols. 306-311). It is left untranslated, since the main paragraphs have been used by Shea.

Eminentissime Domine

Litterae, quas ad me destinare dignata est Em^a Vestra, diebus 9^a et 16^a anni praeteriti, in manus meas non pervenerunt ante diem 26 Novembris. Varia autem documenta litteras comitabantur. 1^o Decretum Sacrae Congregationis de Propagandâ fide quâ me Superiorem missionum in tredecim Confoederatae Americae provinciis ad suum beneplacitum declaravit. 2^o Benignissima suae Sanctitatis concessio et extensio universalis Jubilaei ad omnes Fideles in tredecim Confoederatae Americae provinciis. 3^o Altera ejusdem concessio quâ mihi facultas tribuitur administrandi Sacramentum Confirmationis ad normam Instructionis, quam una recepi. 4^o demum, facultates a Summo D.N. mihi concessae et Sociis in hac Domini vineâ laborantibus communicabiles.

Quod litteris, quibus haec ad me transmisisti documenta, Eminentissime Cardinalis, tantam erga me benevolentiam, tantum rei Catholicae in remotis hisce orbis partibus adjuvandae studium significaveris, gratias habeo et ago maximas, cujus quidem grati animi sensus certiore te prius fecissem, nisi longa imprimis a domo absentia, postea autem intempestiva navigantibus glaciis scribendi occasionem denegasset. Deinde rogo te, ac humillime precor, ut Sanctitatis suae pedibus me sistere, ac devotissimum erga Sedem Apostolicam obsequium testificari velis; gratiasque referre, quod tam gravi munere me indignum non existimaverit.

Hi sunt animi sensus, quibus erga Bmum Patrem, teque a deo, Cardinalis

⁶⁶ USCM, Vol. iii, pp. 376-377.

⁶⁷ *History of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States*, p. 267. New York, 1907.

Eminentissime, affectus fui, ubi propensam utriusque in me benevolentiam, et sollicitam pro Sanctâ nostrâ Religione in his regionibus providentiam intellexerem. Fuere tamen aliasque, quae tum initio, tum deinceps cogitanti mihi, magnum timorem, magnam etiam moestitiam incutiebant. Videbam imprimis illud mihi munus committi, cui subeundo, ut sincere et ex intimo sensu profiteor, imparem me omnino esse sentio, nec illis animi aut corporis viribus praeditum, quibus instructum esse oportet, quicumque se ad illud fideliter administrandum acinxerit. Deinde ut Emin^{ae} T^{ae} votis obsequeretur accuratam de rebus nostris relationem desiderantis, aliqua mihi commemoranda esse non ignorabam, quae minus grata fortasse essent futura, imo quae suspicionem commovere possent minus propensae in Sedem Apostolicam observantiae. Haec tamen omnia veritati postponam, et sinceræ rerum nostrarum expositioni. Scio enim, Em. Card.^{lis}, nihil tuto aut efficaciter circa nos agi posse, nisi quae sit nostra conditio, planè intelligatur.

Imprimis igitur, ex tredecim provinciis, quae olim Regi Magnae Britanniae parebant, duae tantum fuere, Pennsylvania et Marilandia, in quibus permissum erat Catholicis tuto degere: In his etiam lege cautum erat, ne officio civili, militari, aut alio quovis frui possent. Excusso autem jugo Brittanico, novisque conditis legibus, in omnibus provinciis, Catholici sine molestiâ vivere et sacra peragere possunt. In plerisque tamen locis ad Reipublicae munera capessenda non admittuntur, nisi qui omnem jurisdictionem exteram, sive civilem, sive ecclesiasticam abrenuntiaverint. Ita fit, ut in plerisque his provinciis, seu Statibus, ut nunc vocant, nostri homines maneant a Republicâ exclusi: In quatuor tantum, nempe in Pensilvaniâ, Delawariâ, Mariliandiâ, et Virginiâ, eodem ac coeteri cives jure utuntur. Haec autem beneficia, sive tolerantiae, sive juris communis, quamdiu simus habituri, non ausim pronuntiare. Timent e nostris multi, in Mariliandiâ praecipue, A catholicis in animo esse, ut omnino a gerendis muneribus excludamur: ego autem cui satis semper fuit mala non animo praevenire, sed, ubi advenerint, utrumque tolerare, spe foveor tantam nobis injuriam haud esse inferendam: imo vero confido tam firma Religionis fundamenta in his Americanis Statibus jaci posse, ut florentissima Ecclesiae portio, cum magno Sedis Apostolicae solatio, hic aliquando sit futura. Hoc autem loco illa mihi commemoranda sunt, de quibus dixi superius scitu necessaria, ut recte res nostrae Ecclesiasticae possint administrari.

Viguit autem in his regionibus praecipue secta Anglecana; rerum sacrarum apud illos ministri pendebant omnes a Pseudo-Episcopo Londinensi: ad illum transfretabant, quotquot ordinari secundum sectae suae rationem cupiebant. Peracto autem bello, obtineri non potuit a sectae illius ministris, quamvis essent omnium frequentissimi, ut ab Episcopo Anglo, imo ab extero quovis penderent. Concessum est illis potius, ut Episcopos sibi constituerent et eligerent, quod jam ab ipsis factum est, quamvis nullum adhuc suo ritu consecratum habeant: Religionis suae administrandae sibi formam praescripserunt: religionem suam dici et haberi *nationalem* cupiunt, eo quod jam nullum alibi superiorem admittant: denique ita machinantur ut ab illis timor ille incutatur, quo nostrorum nonnullus percuti dicebam.

Eminentissimus Cardinalis persuasum sibi habeat nobis gravissima omnia tolerabiliora fore, quam divinam illam Sedis Apostolicae auctoritatem abrenuntiare: nec tantum Sacerdotes, qui hic sumus, sed etiam populum Catholicum in fide ita videri stabilem, ut nunquam a debita Summo Pontifici obedientiâ sit

dimovendus. Idem tamen ille populus aliquam a B^{mo} Patre gratiam sibi concedi, imo debere existimat, necessariam sane sive ad juris communis quo nunc utitur conservationem, sive ad propulsandum periculum, quod timetur. Ex iis quae dixi, et ex rerum publicarum, quae hic sunt, constitutione, Emin^{ss} Tuae ignotum esse non potest, quam invidiosa illis sit omnis externa jurisdictio. Hocigitur a Catholicis desideratur, ut nulla detur ansa Religionis nostrae adversariis nos criminandi, quasi plus aeque a regimine externo pendeamus; et ut aliqua ratio ineatur quâ in posterum Superior Ecclesiasticus huic regioni destinari possit, ita ut Spiritualis S^{ae} Sedis jurisdictio omnino servetur; et simul tollatur omnis occasio nobis obijciendi, quasi aliquid admittamus patriae Independentiae inimicum. Hoc ex praecipuis Catholicis multi, communi scripto, Sanctitati suae significare cogitabant, ac ii maxime, qui vel in generali Americae Concilio (Congressum vocant) sedem obtinuerunt, vel in Pennsylvania ac Marilandâ conciliis legislativis cum auctoritate intersunt; a quibus tamen obtinui, ut in praesens ejusmodi scriptum differatur. Quid hâc in re statui possit, Beatissimus Pater plenius forsân intelliget, ubi animum advertet ad sextum articulum unionis perpetuae inter Status foederatae Americae; quo sancitur, *nemini licitum fore, qui munere quovis fungatur sub Unitis Statibus, donum aliquod, officium aut titulum cujusvis generis accipere a Rege aliquo, Principe aut domino extero.* Quae prohibitio, etsi ad illos tantum pertinere videatur, qui ad munera Reipublicae destinantur, ab adversariis tamen nostris etiam ad officia Ecclesiastica fortasse detorquebitur. Cupimus igitur, Em^{ss} Cardinalis, omni modo providere, ut fidei integritas, et debita erga Sedem Apostolicam observantia, et unio semper vigeat: at simul ut Catholicis Americanis pro Ecclesiastico regimine concedatur, quidquid salvâ Religione concedi potest. Ita minui sectariorum invidiam plenam suspicionis, ita res nostras stabiliri posse confidimus.

Significasti, Em^{ss} Card^{lis}, Sanctitatis suae mentem esse et consilium, ut Vicarium Apostolicum Episcopali caractere et titulo insignitum pro his provinciis decernat. Ut paterna haec pro nobis sollicitudo magnâ nos laetitia affecit, ita etiam aliquem initio incussit timorem. Sciebam enim A catholicis Americanis olim persuaderi nunquam potuisse, ut vel suae sectae Episcopum admitterent, cum id tentaretur, dum Angliae Regi hae provinciae subessent: unde etiam timor nascebatur, ne nobis quidem id permissum iri. At jam, ab aliquot mensibus, conventionem factâ. Ministrorum Protestantium Ecclesiae Anglicanae, seu Episcopalis, ut nunc vocant, decreverunt se, quod ex legum auctoritate pleno suae Religionis exercitio gaudeant, eo ipso jus habere ad tales rerum Sacrarum Ministros sibi constituendos, quales sectae suae ratio et disciplina exigit, Episcopos scilicet, Presbyteros et Diaconos; cui illorum decreto non repugnaverunt, qui condendis legibus apud nos sunt designati. Cum igitur nobis eadem pro Religionis exercitio libertas concedatur, jus quoque idem, quantum ad leges nostras municipales spectat, competere necesse est.

Re autem se habente, judicabit Beatissimus Pater, tuque adeo, Em^{ss} Card^{lis}, animo perpendes, an tempus constituendo Episcopo opportunum nunc sit, qualis is esse debeat, et quomodo designandus: de quibus omnibus, non tamquam judicium meum interpositurus, sed plenior relationem facturum aliqua commemorabo. Imprimis de opportunitate temporis observari potest, nullam jam animorum fore commotionem, si Episcopus designetur, quod A catholici Protestantes sibi aliquem constituere cogitent: deinde ut aliquam

suae sectae apud vulgus existimationem ex Episcopali dignitate conciliare sperant, ita etiam non solum similem nobis, sed etiam ingentia commoda obventura confidimus, cum hanc Ecclesiam eo modo administrari contigerit, quo Christus Dominus instituit. Ex altera tamen parte occurrit, quod cum jam Smus Pater aliter Sacramento Confirmationis conferendo providere dignatus sit, non prius Episcopum nobis constituere necessitas postulet, quam idonei aliqui reperiantur ad Sacros Ordines suscipiendos, quod paucis annis futurum speramus, ut intelliget Eminensus. Cardinalis ex iis, quae separatim relatione distinctâ scribere cogito. Quod tempus ubi advenerit, commodius fortasse pro decenti Episcopi sustentatione providere, quam nunc pro rerum nostrarum tenuitate, poterimus.

Deinde, si Episcopum nobis assignare Sanctitati suae visum fuerit, praestabitne Vicarium Apostolicum, an Ordinarium cum propria Sede constituere? Quis rei Catholicae incremento, quis amovendae Catholicorum invidiae, terrorique illi de exterâ jurisdictione magis inseviret? quem terrorem auctum iri certissime scio, si Superiorem Ecclesiasticum ita designari noverint, ut ad arbitrium Sacrae Congregationis de propagandâ fide, aut cujusvis alterius tribunalis externi ab officio possit dimoveri: nec fas illi sit Sacerdotem quemvis ad sacras functiones admittere, quem illa Congregatio non approbaverit, et ad nos destinaverit.

De modo autem Episcopum designandi nihil aliud nunc dicam, quam implorare nos, pro Sedis Apostolicae judicio dirigendo divinam sapientiam et misericordiam; ut, si minime concedendum videatur Sacerdotibus in hac Domini vineâ tot annos laborantibus illum suae Sanctitati proponere, quem ipsi magis idoneum existimaverint, conveniatur tamen de aliquâ Episcopum nominandi viâ, quâ Nostratium, tam Catholicorum, quam Sectariorum offensio possit averti.

De Duobus juvenibus ad Urbanum Collegium mittendis nihil agere licuit, donec plenius de Em^{ae} tuae mente intellexero. Si itineris impensis impares fuerint, video quidem a Sacra Congregatione de viatico provisum iri: non tamen habeo compertum, cui demandatum sit illas impensas subministrari. Navium enim magistri in navem vectores recipere non solent, nisi naulum ante navigationem solvatur, aut certo sciant, a quo repetendum sit. Deinde, ut quae dixi de Episcopo vel Superiore designando, aliquam forte mutationem suggerent circa modum res nostras Ecclesiasticas administrandi, ita quoque consilium de educandis in isto Collegio Juvenibus poterit mutari, quod tamen minime futurum confidimus. Postremo, convenerit, ut Juvenum parentes doceantur, an Juramentum aliquod et cujusmodi ab eorum filiis exigendum sit, antequam in patriam remittantur: omnis enim cautela adhibenda est, ut, quantum fieri potest, videantur Catholici, tam populus quam ministri, in rebus tantum omnino necessariis ab exterâ potestate pendere.

Interim, dum responsum exspecto, dabo operam, ut Juvenes duo summâ curâ seligantur, quales tuae litterae, Emin: Card^{lis}, exigunt: spero insuper me effecturum, ut itineris impensae, saltem hinc usque in Galliam a parentibus solvantur: sin minus id obtinuero, omnem in illis impensis moderationem adhiberi curabo. Intelligo autem pro unoquoque juvene navigationis et alios necessarios sumptus, donec portum attigerit, summam septuaginta vel octoginta aureorum circiter confecturos.

Reliqua, de quibus instrui voluisti, Em^e Card^{lis}, pro religiosâ tuâ erga nos sollicitudine, opportunius separato scripto extra formam litterarum

exhiberi posse existimavi; illud tamen hic iterum atque iterum obsecro, ut eam in facultatibus mihi concessis restrictionem tolli omni modo cures, quâ aliorum Sacerdotum operâ uti prohibeor, praeter illos quos sacra Congregatio destinaverit et approbaverit. Id enim nisi concedatur, brevi spatio magna Catholicorum pars ammino Sacramentorum expers erit, et Religionis ministeriis destituta. Unica enim, quae nobis superest spes supplementi cujusdam cito recipiendi pro Sociis extinctis, aut jam ad extremum senium vergentibus, posita est in illis Sacerdotibus, qui hic nati, anti bellum exortum in Europam educationis causâ profecti sunt, ibique sacros Ordines susceperunt. Audio horum aliquos in patriam reditum cogitare: qui quibus tamen, si advenerint, in otio erit manendum, utcumque moribus et doctrinâ comparatis ad hanc Domini vineam excolendam. Itaque, omni quidem reverentiâ, sed simul summâ fiduciâ, et ex plenâ persuasione id è re Religionis fore, rogo, Emin: Cardinalis, ut tuum apud Sanctitatem suam studium interponas, illique significes, Superiori in his Foederatae Americae Statibus omnino necesse est, ut quos Sacerdotes dignos judicaverit, hos in laborum Societatem possit ascire.

Haec habui, Em^e Card.^{lis}, quae liberè fideliterq; scriberem de rebus ad Religionem spectantibus, quibus veluti supplementum et ad tua quaesita responsum accedent, quae altero scripto commemorata reperies. Mihi jam sit permisum hanc gregis Dominici portionem, pastoresq; qui in illo sunt, meo ipsum singulari tuae pietati, paternaeq; benevolentiae commendare; precariq; ut oculos conjicias in immensas illas regiones, quae foederatae Americae finibus continentur: in diesque magis ac magis immigrantium accessionibus, et ex naturali foecunditate, incolentium numero augentur. Ubique liberè praedicari poterit vera fides, nec quidquam ob stare videtur, quo minus magni ex hâc libertate fructus decerpantur, praeter operariorum defectum, mediaque illis providendi. Ad te igitur, qui singulari curâ, studio et auctoritate Religionis propagationi invigilas, recurrimus, ut quae ad hunc finem meditatur, pro tuâ sapientiâ adjuvare velis, hancque regionem veluti tuae providentiae et fidei commissam intueri. Quod ad me spectat, ego summâ fiduciâ, Eminentissime Cardinalis, in hujus Ecclesiae negotiis tua consilia, tuam auctoritatem, pietatem tuam implorabo, precaborque Deum omnipotentem, ut pro animarum salute, divinaeque fidei extensione te salvum et incolumen diù esse velit. Ita vovet

Eminentissime Cardinalis

Eminae Tuae

Servus Obsequentissimus

Ex Marilandâ, die 27^a

Februarii, 1785.

Eminentissimo Cardli Antonello.

JOANNES CARROLL.

In several of the official letters from Propaganda a request was made for certain definite information regarding the state of the Church in the new Republic. This information was asked, as we have seen, through the Nuncio at Paris, on May 12, 1784, in a letter addressed by Cardinal Antonelli to the Chevalier de la Luzerne, French Minister Plenipotentiary, at New York. Cardinal Antonelli's letter to Father Carroll, June 9, 1784, contained the same request. This information Father Carroll obtained by correspondence with his fellow-priests between November, 1784, and March 1, 1785. He embodied this information in his *Relation of the State of Religion in the United*

States. The original is here printed for the first time, from a photostat copy taken in the *Propaganda Archives, America Centrale*, vol. 2, fols. 312-314. An imperfect copy is among the *Shea Transcripts*. The rough draft is in Case 9A-F1, of the *Baltimore Archives*. As the first *Relation* of its kind to be sent to Rome from the United States, it is among the most treasured first-hand sources for the history of the Church in our country:

Relatio pro Emo Cardinali Antonello de statu Religionis in Unitis Foederatae Americae provinciis.

1^o De numero Catholicorum in Foederatae Americae Provinciis.

Sunt in *Marilandâ* circiter 15,800. Ex his sunt novem mille homines liberi aetatis adultae, aut supra annum duodecimum; pueri minoris aetatis fere ter mille, totidemq omnis aetatis servi (Nigros vocant a colore) ex *Africâ* oriundi. In *Pensilvaniâ* sunt ad minimum *septem mille*, inter quos paucissimi *Africani*, vivuntq Catholici collecti magis ac sibi invicem contigui. In *Virginia* sunt non amplius ducenti, quibus quater aut quinquies per annum adest Sacerdos: Dicuntur plurimi alii, tam in illâ, quam in coeteris provinciis sparsim vivere, anni Religionis ministerio destituti. In provinciâ *Norum Eboracum* dictâ, audio esse mille quingentos ad minimum, qui nuper communibus sumptibus ex *Hiberniâ* accersiverunt virum Religiosum Ordinis Si. Francisci; diciturq optimis de moribus et doctrinâ documentis instructus esse: advenerat paulo prius, quam litteras acceperissem, quibus facultates Sociis communicabiles ad me sunt delatae. Dubitavi aliquando, an jure possem hunc pro Sacramentorum administratione approbare. Et jam statui, appropinquante maxime festo Paschali, ipsum pro Socio habere, facultatesq necessarias impertiri, quod meum consilium approbatum iri confido. Nihil certi dicere licet de numero Catholicorum, qui sunt in locis conterminis fluvio dicto *Mississippi*, omnique illi regioni, quae secundum illum fluvium ad Oceanum Atlanticum pertingit, et ab eodem usque ad limites *Carolinae*, *Virginiae*, et *Pensilvaniae* extenditur. Hic tractus continet, ut audio, multos Catholicos, olim *Canadenses*, qui linguâ *Gallicâ* utuntur, quos rerum sacrarum Ministris destitutos esse valde metuo. Transivit ad illos nuper Sacerdos quidam Germanus, sed ex *Galliâ* ultimo profectus, qui ex ordine *Carmelitarum* se esse profitetur: nullo tamen sufficiente testimonio muniebatur, missum se esse a legitimo Superiore. Quid agat, et quo statu ibi sint res Catholicae, edoctum me iri propediem expecto. *Episcopi Quebecensis* jurisdictio in aliquam regionis illius partem olim pertinuit: an nunc autem, cum omnes in foederatae Americae ditionem cesserint, potestatem ullam exercere velit, haud equidem scio.

2^o Catholicorum conditione, pietate, abusibus, &c.

In *Marilandâ*, paucae ex praecipuis et ditioribus familiis, a primis provinciae fundamentis, fidem Catholicam a progenitoribus huc invectam adhuc profitentur: major autem pars sunt agricolae, et in *Pensilvaniâ* fere omnes, exceptis mercatoribus et opificibus, qui *Philadelphiae* degunt. Quod ad pietatem spectat, sunt, ut plurimum, in Religionis exercitiis et Sacramentorum frequentatione satis assidui: sed sine illo fervore, quem solet excitare continua ad sensua pietatis exhortatio: vix enim singulis mensibus, aut etiam bimestri spatio plurimae Congregationes rem divinam, et concionem sibi fieri audiunt: ita Sacerdotum inopiâ, multoq magis, locorum intervallo, itinerisq incommodis opprimimur: Haec de indigenis dicta sint: alia enim longe est ratio Catholicorum, qui magno numero ex variis Europae nationibus ad nos confluent.

Cum enim ex nostratibus pauci sint, qui non aepius per annum, praecipue autem tempore paschali ad Sacramenta Poenitentiae et Eucharistiae accedant; vix reperitur inter priores illos, qui officium hoc Religionis exerceat; quorum exemplum in urbibus mercatoriis maxime perniciosum fore timetur. Abusus inter Catholicos sunt illi maxime, qui ex necessariâ cum A Catholicis familiaritate, et exemplis inde collectis oriuntur; liberior nempe se tractandi ratio inter juniores personas diversi sexus, quam animi, aut forte etiam corporis integritas patiatur; nimis propensum studium ad saltationes, et id genus alia; et incredibilia aviditas (in puellis praecipue) legendi fabulas amatorias, quae magno numero ad nos adveniunt. Deinde, in coeteris universim defectus diligentiae in educandis ad Religionem liberis, sed praecipue servis Africanis, totiusque illius curae ad Sacerdotes transmissio; ex quo fit, ut cum sint continuo laboribus exerciti; raroque et non nisi ad breve tempus cum Sacerdote esse possint, in fide rudes et in moribus turpissimi plerique esse soleant. Incredibile est quantum animarum postoribus molestiae et sollicitudinis facessant.

3^o De numero Presbyterorum, studiis, et modo se sustendandi.

Sunt in *Marilandâ* Presbyteri novemdecim: In *Pensilvaniâ* quinque. Ex his autem duo sunt supra, tres alii proximum ad septuagesimum annum accedunt; adeoque omnino impares subeundis laboribus, sine quibus hac Domini vinea coli non potest. Inter reliquos Presbyteros, aliqui admondum infirmâ valetudine utuntur; et unus est nuper a me approbatus, ad paucos menses tantum, ut experimentum illius faciam in extrema operariorum necessitate. Aliqua enim de ipso narrabantur, quae vehementer me deterrebant ab illius operâ adhibendâ. Ego quidem illi, quantum passum, invigilabo; et si quid acciderit gravitate sacerdotali minus dignum, facultates concessas revocabo, quantumcunque incommodum multis Catholicis inde eventurum sit. Mihi enim persuasum est Catholicam fidem minus detrimenti passuram, si nulli Sacerdotes per breve tempus fuerint, quam si, ubi ita vivimus inter alterius Religionis homines, ad sacra ministeria assumuntur. non dicam mali, Sacerdotes, sed etiam imprudentes et incauti. Reliqui omnes Sacerdotes plenam laboris vitam agunt, quod unusquisque congregationibus longe diassitis obsequium praestet, adeoque continuis, gravissimisque equitationibus, ad aegrotos praecipue, continuo fatigetur. Presbyteri sustentantur ut plurimum ex fundorum providentibus; alibi vero liberalitate Catholicorum. Nulla hic proprie sunt bona Ecclesiastica. Privatorum enim nomine possidentur ea bona, ex quibus aluntur Presbyteri; et testamentis transferuntur ad haereditas: ita faciendum suggessit dira necessitas, dum legibus Catholica Religio his arcaretur; neque adhuc inventum est huic incommodo remedium, quamvis a nobis anno elapso id tentaretur.

Ad procurandos in Religionis ministerio successores, quid faciendum sit, non satis intelligimus. Est jam Philadelphiae collegium, agiturque de duobus in *Marilandâ* extruendis, ad quo admitti poterunt Catholici aequae ac alii, tam Praesides, quam Professores et alumni. Fore speramus, ut hos inter aliqui vitam Ecclesiasticam velint amplecti. Cogitamus igitur de seminario instituendo, in quo valeant deinceps ad mores et doctrinam statui illi convenientes efformari.

Hâc factâ relatione, liceat nunc aliqua adjungere quo omnino necessaria judico ad spirituales Catholicorum administrationem. Imprimis ex quotidiano commercio cum A Catholicis, oritur perpetuum discrimen ineundi cum illis

contractus matrimonialis, ad quod periculum avertendum usus apud nos invaluerat dispensandi, quantum nobis permittebatur, inter consanguineos Catholicos. Ita non solum conservari Religionem, sed augeri ab experientia didicimus. Ut igitur Ssmus Pater facultates mihi benigne concessit, Sociis etiam communicabiles, *dispensandi in 3^o mixto cum 2^o*, et inferioribus consanguinitatis et affinitatis gradibus; ita humillime tam meo, quam Sociorum nomine precor, ut saltem ad Superiorem extendere velit facultates dispensandi *in 2^o simplici*, tam consanguinitatis quam affinitatis. Si autem illud generaliter concedi nequit, quod propter locorum distantium maxime optandum esset, *pro triginta ad minimum riabus* precor, ut ita dispensandi mihi detur facultas. Vehementer etiam a Sociis meis desideratur, ut possit hic *dispensari in primo gradu affinitatis* ortae ex copula illicita. Hos enim impedimentum esse subsistit inter Africanos praecipue, ante matrimonium attentatum; nec tamen nisi longum post tempus, multorumq; annorum cohabitationem Sacerdos impedimentum, fortuito plerumq; deprehendit.

Video praeterea dispensationem celebrandi missam post meridiem, *ad unam tantum horam* extendi; cum tamen aliquando confessiones expediri non possint *ante tres horas*, quod mihi certe saepe contigit a prima aurora illud ministerium auspicanti; credebamq; in ejusmodi casibus legem charitatis validiorem esse, quam ut Sacramentorum expertes domum remitterentur, qui magnolabore et incommodo, viginti, triginta aut amplius mille passus venerant, et saepe in his mulieres gravidae et partui proximae.

Hac item in re Sanctitatis suae mentem ulterius declarari cupimus.

Si quae alia occurrant, de quibus intellexero gratum fore, ut ad Emum Cardinalem relatio fiat, plene conscribam.

JOANNES CARROLL.

Die 1^a Martii 1785.

The two problems which clouded his immediate horizon were the "cramping clauses" which practically robbed him of all power, as can be seen in his letter to Father Thorpe, of February 17, 1785, given above, and the question of a bishopric for the United States. The task before him and before the little band of workers he had in the American Vineyard was immense, he told his friend Father Plowden, in a letter dated June 29, 1785. "I receive applications from every part of the United States, north, south, and west, for clergymen, and considerable property is offered for their maintenance; but it is impossible and cruel to abandon the congregation already formed to go in quest of people who wish to be established into new ones." His inability to give faculties to new arrivals in the ministry was the most unfortunate part of his embarrassing situation. The presence of other priests in the country who carried on their ministrations without recognizing him as Superior, also added to the delicate position he held. Fortunately, on receiving Carroll's letter of February 17, 1785, Father Thorpe immediately acted by having the doubt settled at Rome; and on July 2, 1785, and again on August 31, 1785, he informed the Prefect-Apostolic that a blunder had occurred and that the "cramping clauses" against which "you had with great reason remonstrated should be struck out of the printed faculties and . . . were never meant to be where you found them, left by an oversight in the Secretary's office." As Carroll learned later, the formula of his appointment was based on that of a Prefect-Apostolic sent

from Rome with missionaries to Africa, and they quite naturally contained the clause that he was not to give faculties to any priest in his jurisdiction unless the same were sent of Propaganda. On July 23, 1785, Cardinal Antonelli wrote to Father Carroll, thanking him for the *Letter and Relation* of February-March, 1785, and approving his stand; and sending him a new formula of faculties, which allowed Carroll to receive priests into the country and to appoint them at will.⁴⁴ The second of these problems, namely, the appointment of a Superior with episcopal powers as well as jurisdiction, was not settled until November 14, 1789, when Father John Carroll was appointed Bishop of Baltimore.

There was more than the prefatory phrases of the man raised to a unique and important post in his *Letter* to Antonelli. The task before him was a delicate one; the field of his labors was, to use his own word, immense in extent and in possibilities. His jurisdiction, meagre as it was in its amplitude, was the only bond uniting the new Republic to the Holy See. He felt himself utterly incapable of bringing all the elements of Catholic life in the United States into strict conformity with canonical rule. The number of his priests was limited; many of them were old men, worn out with the fatigues and burdens of the harsh life the missionaries were forced to lead. The distances were many times greater in those days than now. Means of communication were slow and uncertain; and the very liberty which the new Republic had proclaimed to all the earth and the inhabitants thereof opened the way to adventurers ecclesiastic as it did to adventurers lay or civil. It was indeed a task arduous enough to terrify even one who did not possess John Carroll's courage and spirit of devotion. The five years of his Prefecture saw all these elements for good and for evil in the Catholic life of the Republic develop with a rapidity which soon dispelled any lingering doubts in the minds of his clergy on the necessity of a more compact canonical organization. Within twenty months the clergy had met again at Whitemarsh and petitioned the Holy See for a bishop. The administration of Church property was causing quarrels and scandals which were threatening the unity of the Church in the United States; the Revolution had not amalgamated the races that had fought side by side for liberty, and the spirit of nationalism in Church affairs was even then looming up as a potent source of antagonism. Religious toleration was not a law of the land in 1785, and did not become universally so until long after the Constitutional Convention of 1787. Dissension in the Church was apparent at the very time when the closest harmony was needed to start religious freedom on its noble way down the years of American life. The ranks of the clergy were thinning rapidly—death and disease were decimating the little band of workers, and if the Church was to live, vocations would need to be fostered, priests would have to be invited to come to the United States from other lands, and only one endowed with all the power of the episcopate could keep that strict control on ecclesiastical life without which there could be no surety of duration. These five years of Carroll's

⁴⁴ HUGHES, *op. cit.*, Documents, Vol. II, p. 635.

Prefectship were as critical in their own way to the Church as was the uncertainty which ruled the political life of the nation between the Treaty of Paris in 1783, and Washington's election to the Presidency in 1789. It is a singular, not to say providential, coincidence that Washington and Carroll came to their offices at the same time. Washington was inaugurated April 30, 1789; Carroll was consecrated August 15, 1790, and our political organization was fully fashioned in the very year that our Church organization was perfected. It was a coincidence emblematic of the amity and concord "which have hitherto existed between the Church and the republic—amity and concord which, instead of being obliterated, are emphasized by the clear-cut distinction made in our fundamental law between the two spheres, the political and the religious."

PETER GUILDAY.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Danish West Indies under Company Rule (1671-1754).

By Waldemar Westergaard, Ph.D. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1917. Pp. xxiv+359.

History, more than the Constitution, may be said to follow the flag. Historical investigation in the United States has kept pace with the expansion of American interests and the extension of American sovereignty in the Caribbean and Gulf regions. And it was very satisfying to see, within a year of our purchase of the Danish West Indies, an historical study of these islands from the pen of an American scholar.

In a sense the islands find their first historian in the author of the present volume. Not even Danish historians have attempted a thorough investigation of the sources of Danish colonial history. Excellent biographies of two of the governors of St. Thomas and some studies of special topics are found, but nothing like a complete, scientific treatment based on primary sources. And what Danish scholars, with the materials at hand, neglected, English-speaking students can be pardoned for overlooking. The English literature on our new possessions was made up practically of the work of John P. Knox written sixty years ago, and of which the meritorious portions are faulty translations from the Danish, a book by Charles Edward Taylor published in 1888, which represents the use of some archival material, Appleton Griffin's list of works in the library of Congress, which is the only special bibliography on the subject, the document prepared for Congress in 1902, and some chapters in general works on Danish and West Indian history. In view of these facts Dr. Westergaard is almost a pioneer. Even L. K. Zabriskie's *The Virgin Islands of the United States of America*, which appeared last year, does not compare as history with the work here under review.

The Danish West India Company under Company Rule grew out of the author's examination of some important documents for this subject in the Bancroft Library at the University of California. The insufficiency of printed materials led the author to Denmark where the State Archives, the Royal Library and the

Municipal Archives in Copenhagen yielded a wealth of manuscript sources. These, with the printed sources and the secondary literature, were gone through, and the results are to be embodied in three books. The first of these, which we now have, covers the period of company rule. The second will continue the history to the end of the Napoleonic Wars. The third will conclude with the present time. This first volume, originally a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of California, is supplemented by a summary of the period from 1754-1915 to meet the interest aroused by the purchase of the islands.

The Danish experiment in the West Indies is a small part of the great colonial and commercial expansion of Europe. When the English, the French, and the Dutch were making enormous inroads into the Portuguese monopoly in the East and the Spanish monopoly in the West, Denmark was in no position to play any important rôle. The prowess of the Viking Age was a tradition which had no promise of renewal. During the years when Denmark, Norway, and Sweden were held together by the Union of Kolmar, plans for American exploration had been made, but without any result. Then the separation of Sweden, political crises, religious troubles resulting from the Reformation, and economic decline reduced Danish resources to a low level. Again the promise that lay in the movements pushed by the enterprising king, Christian IV, in the early years of the seventeenth century was frustrated. Voyages were made to Greenland and Hudson Bay, companies were formed for trade with Iceland, France, and Spain, a Danish East India Company was established, and a Danish West India Company was proposed. But the king's failure in the German religious wars reacted on commercial conditions at home, and the results of these hopeful beginnings were meagre. Finally, when the *coup d'état* of Frederick III, in 1660, had given Denmark an efficient absolute monarchy, government leadership of trade and an era of peace and advantageous diplomacy made it possible for Denmark to enter the West Indies. Danish ships privately owned had already sailed to West Indian waters but now there came an opportunity to colonize. The island of St. Thomas, with an excellent harbor, was unoccupied; the relations of Denmark to the other powers would allow the Danes to retain it; and the

active support of the home government would make the plan feasible. Accordingly the Danish West India Company was established, and in the same year the settlers arrived at St. Thomas. In 1683, the neighboring island of St. John was claimed, and settled in 1717. In 1733, St. Croix was purchased from the French. In 1754, company rule ended and the Crown assumed direct control until 1916.

The history of these islands under company rule has a three-fold interest. American colonial history is a part of European history, which it constantly reflects and by which it was always determined. The similarity of chartered companies in colonial history makes a study of the Danish Company very helpful in understanding the others, and the economic solidarity of the West Indies causes the history of any portion of them to be typical of general conditions. Hence this account of the workings of the Danish Company, of the administration of the colony, of its relations to Europe and to its neighbors, and of its commercial concerns presents a valuable cross-section of universal history in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It is to be noted that Dr. Westergaard's treatment takes advantage of these large possibilities of his subject.

It is not within the purpose of this review to recount the contents of the book. The reader is recommended to learn them directly. The islands are described. The fortunes of the colony are set forth chronologically through six chapters, and whatever of European history affects the islands is introduced. Then follow accounts of the slave trade, the relations of slave and planter, and of the latter to the company. These chapters (vii, viii, ix) are, perhaps, the most interesting part of the work. The last chapters deal with the acquisition of St. Croix and the final years of company rule. West Indian life is shown from every angle, economic, political, social, and religious. The economic interest, of course, dominates. The *raison d'être* of the colony was economic. One moves for the most part among planters, slaves, traders, factors, and questions of production and distribution. These are really the significant things of the book. But there is nothing of "the dismal science" about it. Things that might be caviare to the general reader—statistics of sugar and cotton, lists of exports, prices, slave cargoes and the like—

are wisely put in the appendix. The political questions are suggestive by reason of the fact that they are concerned with movements for self-government among the planters. For social history one meets slave conditions, the theater, the tavern, the newspaper. The religious world of the colonists comes in for some slight mention, the most interesting references being to mission work among the blacks and some religious statistics.

Dr. Westergaard writes most engagingly. He has enlivened his narrative with portraits of striking individuals and dramatic episodes. The figures in his portrait gallery range from Captain Kidd and the Hohenzollern Great Elector—both of whom had relation with this colony—to mutinous blacks. And if we insist rather on the readable character of the book than on its prime value as history, the reason is that the latter merit, too obvious for comment, has been recognized since the book appeared. The eagerness with which the two promised sequels are awaited is an all-sufficient praise.

The work is well documented, has a good index, and the best available bibliography on the subject. The nine maps and four illustrations are well chosen and well reproduced. The format of the book leaves nothing to be desired. The late Prof. Henry Morse Stephens, of the University of California, contributed an introduction "to set forth the results of Dr. Westergaard's labors as bearing upon the general history of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries."

J. M. EGAN, S.T.L.

Ten Years near the German Frontier. By Maurice Francis Egan, former United States Minister to Denmark. New York: George H. Doran Company. 1919. Price, \$3 net.

In many respects memoirs are perhaps the most fascinating department of letters, combining, as they do, the charm of romance (for anyone to be at all justified in publishing memoirs must at least have rubbed elbows with romance), with the realism of history, and affording that intimate glimpse of persons and personalities which appeals to the spark of curiosity in the least gossip-loving of us all and demonstrates the kinship of the world. Time was when we had no choice but to say "They do

these things better in France," but if many volumes of memoirs similar to this of Dr. Egan's come out of America we shall no longer be under this necessity. The author's literary ability, which was long since established, was only one of the qualifications he took to his post as minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Denmark. Ten years of diplomatic service abroad is no slight record, and when we consider that these ten years covered the period just prior to and including the four years that have come to be recognized as among the most momentous in the history of the world, and remember that they were spent at Copenhagen, "a place where every diplomat in the world went at some time or other," we cannot be astonished that, given the literary skill of the author, the chronicle should turn out to be so replete with interest.

Denmark, it is true, would seem to have been somewhat "off the map," as far as the war was concerned; it was officially neutral, although from the Prussian standpoint it was German. We have had countless books written by men and women who prior to the war were residing and even holding official positions in what became enemy territory, or who were caught in the war zone at the outbreak of hostilities, but naturally enough many of these convey the impression of having been written at too close range; their authors could not see the wood for the trees. But Dr. Egan had the advantage of an excellent perspective, and, at the same time, of being near enough to see and hear a great many important things. In the very first chapter of his book he shows that Denmark was not so far off the map as at first one might be inclined to think, inasmuch as the Prussian policy which resulted in the Great War began with the annexation by Germany, in 1864, of the Danish province of Slesvig and the Kiel Canal.

We know now what an important element this seizure was in the formation of the great fleet that was to have dominated the world, and with our dearly purchased after-sight we recognize readily enough that the seizure of Denmark would have been but a small item in the further pursuit of this rapacious policy, and still smaller, but to us how tremendous, would have been the seizure of the Danish colonies. For included among those colonies at that time were the islands of St. Thomas, St. John and Ste. Croix (Santa Cruz), in the West Indies, the first two

forming a part of what Columbus called the Virgin Islands. Now the first of these, St. Thomas, lies thirty-six miles east of Porto Rico, the possession of the United States of America and of inestimable strategic value.

When one reads things like this one realizes that the Government does not maintain in European countries a picked body of clever men merely that they may be of use to American citizens who get into difficulties in foreign parts, nor in order that they may participate not too discredibly in brilliant court functions in the name of a great and independent democracy. For this book was not written merely to furnish attractive sketches of crowned heads and diplomats and international celebrities nor to record brilliant bits of conversation—though it does both—but in order to place on record the negotiations which resulted in the purchase of the Danish West Indies by the United States of America, and it is written by the person best qualified to do so, the man who recognized the paramount importance of the step to this country and who as her accredited representative had the difficult task of influencing to this end the votes of the Danish people—for the question was put to a plebiscite.

All the difficulties he encountered are recorded here with just that saving grace that lifts the book—serious history though it is—out of the dry-as-dust category and gives it a place on the not-too-crowded shelf which holds the volumes one reads for entertainment as well as instruction, the kind of thing that Horace Walpole did wittingly and Pepys unwittingly. It detracts nothing from the reliability of the narrative that, although we know the purchase to have become an accomplished fact, the story of the preliminaries is told with a dramatic touch that makes us hold our breath with anxiety for the outcome. But through all the pages runs this note, born of the literary sense, without which how many historians are born, which breathes the breath of life into the men and women they depict and who are so far removed from us in antecedent and environment that, at the mercy of a less skilled pen, they would have been in danger of remaining mere smears of ink. It inclines one to think that not every German utterance was wholly false, and that Count Henckel-Donnersmarck, many of whose enlightening remarks are set down here, was right when he said:

"The point of view is made by literature." In this instance it is not too much to say that literature has been made by a point of view, enhanced by a sense of humor.

BLANCHE MARY KELLY.

American Negro Slavery, by Ulrich Bonnell Phillips, Ph.D. New York. D. Appleton and Company, 1919.

Professor Phillips' book is an attempt to sketch the rise, nature, and influence of Negro slavery in the regions of its concentration.

American Negro Slavery covers a good deal of ground in its five hundred and fourteen pages. There are chapters on what most of us in our boyhood used to associate with the "romantic" side of slavery, in which we renew acquaintance with such men and institutions as Las Casas, Sir John Hawkins, the Dutch West India Company and the slave-markets. Also, there are chapters on tobacco, rice, cotton, and sugar, which we recall as influences that tended to make slavery a fixture in this country. There are other chapters that recount the rise of moral scruples in Colonial times and their prostitution at a later date to political expedients. Finally, there are pictures, charming pictures indeed, of plantation life in which is fully satisfied the conventional idea of the plantation Negro as a sort of "double-shuffling" and "possum-hunting" individual.

All this is enough to show that what Professor Phillips has done is not so much to give us a new book as to furnish us with complete information with which we may correct and augment our somewhat hazy and indefinite notions of American slavery. The majority of people have obtained their conceptions of slave conditions from novels, and rather poor ones at that, and from sensational films. Even where the desire for knowledge was more pretentious the only material at hand was of a violently biased nature meant not to explore and portray facts but to exploit traditions and prejudices. There is probably no one subject in American history that is more thoroughly and more generally misunderstood than the ante-bellum situation of the Negro. The consequence is that, failing in our knowledge of the Negro's

history, we make but futile attempts to adjust him to our society.

The sanity of Professor Phillips and his adherence to historical accuracy will be revealed to many minds in his persistently implied refusal to admit that slavery was ever universally in the nation the moral issue that fancy or interest have sometimes made it. The author does not defend the introduction of slavery into this country, nor even justify its continuance. It is too late in the day to do that. He rather suggests that too many politicians have been cloaking themselves in a glory to which they are not entitled. Most men will agree that traditions in anti-slavery circles cannot always be relied upon.

With regard to the treatment of slaves Professor Phillips would urge what decency will force us to admit, that slave-owners were not always the wicked persons that they have been painted. He rather pushes the point that the South as a whole was constantly engaged in getting the good out of a bad bargain. Thus, on page 343 we read that "the slave plantation regime, after having wrought the initial and irreparable misfortune of causing the Negroes to be imported, did at least as much as any possible system in the period could have done toward adapting the bulk of them to life in a civilized community." Or again on page 401: "Plantation slavery had in strictly business aspects at least as many drawbacks as it had attractions. But in the large it was less a business than a life; it made fewer fortunes than it made men."

Such considerations do not excuse slavery. No one says that they do. But the question is: Could not the moral sense of the nation have been satisfied just as fully by economic, as by political action? Governor F. H. Pierpont of Virginia said, in 1865, that the condition of the Negroes was hard since they had "the theory of the politicians and the dogma of the divines against them." On the side of abolition, however, the politicians set themselves a task, the magnitude and treatment of which they were in most cases incapable of understanding.

Slavery was bound to disappear because of its inherent economic weakness. Certain well-known utterances prove that from the days of Washington and Jefferson considerable doubt had been thrown on the value of slavery, while the belief was

steadily growing that slavery was a detriment to the best interests of the community. One cannot but regret that the work of Raymond, Dew, Goodloe, and Ruffin was set aside in favor of the more theatrical but less substantial efforts of politicians. Had such a substitution not taken place, we might have been spared the dark days of Reconstruction, from the evil consequences of which the Negro race is even yet suffering. Surely we would have been spared that unethical course of conduct which permitted the exposure of Negroes to vagrancy, idleness, famine, and in far too many instances to death. Professor Phillips' chapters on the economic and business aspects of slavery will prove to many the most interesting in his book.

If it should be urged that in view of the circumstances a violent disruption by legislative action was the only possible way of restoring justice, it could be answered that certainly by 1850, the merely business aspects of slavery were showing that enforced slave labor was a losing game. We have it on first-rate evidence, for example, that the people of Virginia were prepared for the emancipation of the blacks long before the Civil War.

In view of the existing ignorance regarding the details of the Negro's past it is a praiseworthy thing that the author has given us his reflections in an attractive and popular style. It is a distinct relief to meet with a writer who does not interpret his "scientific" obligations in the sense that he must be heavy and unreadable. Perhaps some will object to the great bulk of the book. Of course, Professor Phillips touches upon a great variety of subjects connected with the rise and development of slavery. But there are times especially in the early part of the work when one feels that the author could have helped the reader by a little condensation. This is trivial where there is so much else of worth.

T. B. MORONEY, S.T.D.

NOTES AND COMMENT

A hundred years ago found the Church in the United States united under one archbishop, the Most Reverend Ambrose Maréchal, who succeeded Archbishop Neale on July 4, 1817, and who ruled over his vast province until his death on January 28, 1828. An ecclesiastical map of the United States in 1820, would show the Province of Baltimore subdivided into eight Dioceses: 1. That of BALTIMORE itself, which included Maryland and the District of Columbia; 2. BOSTON, which comprehended "all New England, including Maine," as the *Laité's Directory* for 1822 (p. 101), describes it; 3. NEW YORK, which included the State of New York, together with the northern part of New Jersey; 4. PHILADELPHIA, including the two States of Pennsylvania and Delaware, and the southern part of New Jersey; 5. BARDSTOWN, which was "of prodigious extent" (*ibid.*, p. 108), included the States of Kentucky, Tennessee, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, with Michigan Territory and the North West Territory; 6. LOUISIANA, included "the whole ancient Louisiana, as sold by France to the United States, together with the Floridas (*ibid.*, p. 111);" 7. RICHMOND, included the State of Virginia; 8. CHARLESTON, included the three States of North and South Carolina, and Georgia.

The *Laité's Directory* of 1822, devotes pages 72-126 to a description of the Church in the United States for the year 1821-22. An interesting picture of the State of the Church in 1820, might be drawn from this valuable source as well as from Shea's *History*, and from Grassi's *Notizie Varie*, of 1819. Certain salient points would need little emphasis to give them prominence in the picture. One evil of the day was prevalent enough seriously to threaten for a time the unity of the Church in the United States in 1820—Trusteeism. Trustee troubles were not confined to any one particular section of the country nor was any single bishop called upon to solve the problems they presented. The fact is that they were limited by the boundaries of no diocese; their blighting influence was felt on all (TREACY, *Evils of Trusteeism, Historical Records and Studies*, vol. viii, p. 145). Baltimore had inherited from Bishop Carroll's time a disturbing element in the German Catholics of that city as well as in Irish malcontents at Norfolk and at Charleston. Shea describes the cause as follows: "Little knots of malcontents in Norfolk and Charleston, men destitute of religion who seldom or never approached the Sacraments, actually through the Irish hierarchy, whose good faith they abused, and through Rev. Robert Browne and his confederates at Rome, influenced the action of Propaganda, and of course, not in the best interests of the Church in the United States. The Very Rev. John Rice, O. S. A., who possessed great influence in Rome, is said to have been the most active in this unjustifiable interference in the affairs of the Church in America" (SHEA, *op. cit.*, iii, p. 57).

The result of this interference was that the Holy See sided with those opposed to Archbishop Maréchal, and in July, 1820, secret bulls were issued creating the Diocese of Virginia, with the episcopal see at Richmond, and the Diocese of the Carolinas-Georgia, with the episcopal see at Charleston. Rev. Patrick Kelly was appointed Bishop of Richmond, and Rev. John England, Bishop of Charleston. "By this hasty and inconsiderate action," says Shea, "the Diocese of Baltimore constituted two portions, a thousand miles apart, Maryland and the District of Columbia on the Atlantic, and Alabama and Mississippi in the southwest" (*ibid*, p. 58). Not only did Richmond and Charleston receive bishops who were utter strangers to the country, but so also had New York and Philadelphia. These four Bishops were nominated, Shea claims, by the influence of a foreign hierarchy, and in some cases bound in the very act of their consecration by an oath of allegiance to the British Government, at that time unfriendly to the United States.

Bishop Connolly, O. P., of New York (1814-1825) was familiar to a certain extent with the general condition of the Church in the United States; he had acted for a number of years as agent at Rome for Archbishop Carroll.

Bishop Patrick Kelly was about forty years old when he was appointed to Richmond, and at the time was President of St. John's Seminary, Birchfield, Kilkenny, Ireland. Shea sums him up as a man "of great strength and colossal proportions, but though pious, prudent, and of great integrity, he was rigid, unyielding, and haughty." A tradition is extant that he had grown tired of the burdens of college life imposed upon him, and that he appealed to his friend, Archbishop Troy, of Dublin, to secure him a Bishopric in North America. One of his letters from the Propaganda Archives (America Centrale, Vol. 40, folios 159-161), to the Father John Rice, who had aided the Norfolk malcontents, mentions this rumor.

Birchfield, Kilkenny, July 16, 1820.

Rev. and Dr. friend,

I received a day or two ago your very unwelcome favour of the 22d ult. in which you congratulate me on my elevation to the See of Virginia in America: jocosely, I suppose, as anyone's elevation to any see however accomplished he be and howsoever well acquainted with the state of religion in his church is matter of condolence rather than congratulation; how much more is that of me who have no pretensions to any of those accomplishments natural or acquired which dignify the Bishop and who, besides, am an utter stranger to the state of religion not only in that church to which you say I am called, but even in that of which I am now a member. Your letter especially in this affair of my exaltation has been to me a source of more serious uneasiness than I recollect to have experienced since the night previous to my receiving the Subdeaconship. I am determined, however, to suffer the will of God to have its course and earnestly hope that, if my exaltation contribute not to the sanctification of God's name and the coming of his Kingdom, he will by some means or other prevent its taking place.

The letter to which you allude in the first paragraph of your letter is, I suppose, that which you wrote some time last year to Father Nowlan. If any inconveniences have arisen to you from that communication, I must candidly confess, it ought, as far as my knowledge goes, to be laid at my door, and not at his. For as soon as he received that letter he sent for me and gave it me to read. Having read it, I felt offended at it, though I do not now recollect what it was in particular that provoked me: but I believe it was the report you mentioned in that letter, as then afloat in Rome of my going or having gone to America, and your desire to know whether this supposed journey of mine originated in misunderstanding with my Bishop or not. After I read the letter, Father Nowlan asked me what did I think of it. I answered peevishly: it does not concern me as I am neither going nor have gone nor do I desire to go to America nor did it ever enter my head to intrigue for a mitre. What answer, said he, shall I make Father Rice? None at all on my part, said I. So that if Father Nowlan have not since answered your letter and I cannot affirm whether he has or not, the omission ought to be attributed to me rather than him. Morisey too was at that time in Rome and it occurred to me that he might have given birth to the report with a view to injure Dr. Marum, on that account I mentioned the circumstance to his Lordship: but I have not since heard whether he made any use of the information or not. Perhaps this naked but true statement may serve to clear up what you cannot explain in the conduct of Father Nowlan. With respect to my ability to bring out with me three young clergy qualified as you deem requisite, I feel no hesitation in saying I could lead forth with me four times that number if necessary, were the means at hand of bearing their expenses out and places there provided for them on their arrival. So that if the church of Virginia require the auxiliaries you mention, you should lose no time in applying to the Propaganda for the necessary aid. Any young man proposing to go with me will be opposed by his relatives as I myself expect to be opposed strongly by mine, so that no help can be drawn from those quarters. I have not yet thought of how my own expenses are to be supplied. Adieu and believe me,

Your affl. friend and servant,

PATRICK KELLY.

Bishop Kelly's career in America was a brief and unpleasant one. He was consecrated by Archbishop Troy on August 24, 1820, "the oath of allegiance to the King of England being administered" (SHEA, *ibid.*, p. 29). Shortly afterwards he sailed for New York, and in due time presented himself to his metropolitan, Archbishop Maréchal, at Baltimore. The Archbishop left no doubt in Dr. Kelly's mind as to his position in the matter. As plainly as he could, he stated that the new bishop was unwelcome, that he could proceed or not, as he wished, to take possession of the new See and Diocese of Virginia, according to the tenor of the Bulls transmitted to him. "But to assure the tranquility of our conscience," the written protest (January 18, 1821), of the Archbishop reads, "we hereby distinctly declare to your Lordship that we in no wise give or yield our assent positively to this most unfortunate action of the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide. If you carry it out, we are to be held free before God and the Church now and hereafter from all the

evils and scandals which the Catholic religion suffers or may suffer from it in these United States." The following day, January 19, 1821, Bishop Kelly set out for Norfolk. In July, 1822, he was recalled by the Holy See and was transferred to the See of Waterford-Lismore, Ireland. He died October 8, 1829.

✓ Luke Delmeyer

A sympathetic sketch of his life will be found in the *History and Antiquities of the Diocese of Ossory*, Vol. i. pp. 272-275. Morse attacks his appointment rather viciously in his *Foreign Conspiracy against the Liberty of the United States* (New York, 1835). In the *General's Descriptio Provinciae Metropolitanae Baltimorensis in foedcrati Americanae Septentrionalis Statibus*, for 1821-1822 (HUGHES, *History of the S. J., etc.*, Documents, Vol. ii, p. 959), the *praesens status religionis* for Richmond has but one word: *Confusio*. Bishop Kelly had but two priests, two churches, and 2,400 Catholics, but the task of keeping his flock in peace was beyond his powers.

In Philadelphia, Bishop Conwell had likewise inherited a legacy of disorder. He arrived in his episcopal See about the first of December, 1820, and his presence in the Pro-Cathedral the first Sunday morning was made the occasion of a public attack upon the hierarchy by that notorious disturber of the peace in Philadelphia—Rev. William Hogan, the author of the Schism which bears his name. Dr. Conwell's episcopate was a virtual martyrdom, and his recall to Rome in 1827-1828, together with his own impetuous action in returning to Philadelphia without announcement, form a very interesting, if not tragic, episode of this time. The late Martin I. J. Griffin's *Life of Bishop Conwell* (ACHS Records), contains all that need be known on the unfortunate bishop's career. His appointment to Philadelphia came about as follows: When Archbishop O'Reilly, of Armagh, died, Dr. Conwell, who was Vicar-General of the diocese, was the unanimous choice of the priests for the archiepiscopal See, but Dr. Curtis, the President of the Irish College at Salamanca, was chosen, and Dr. Conwell was given his choice of Madras or Philadelphia by the Holy See. In the light of his choice of Philadelphia, the following unpublished letter from the pen of Dr. Curtis to Monsignor Argenti, Secretary of the Congregation, is highly significant. The original is in French (*Propaganda Archives, America Centrale*, vol. 4, No. 143).

Sir,

I have the honor to receive, at this moment, your letter of the 22nd of last month enclosing the receipt regarding the advowson gift of the two parishes of Drogheda and Turfechan, which His Holiness was pleased to make to me and which had been a long time united as a source of revenue of the Primate.

You tell me at the same time that you will send me the Pallium as soon as possible; on receiving it I will heartily fulfil the duty of acknowledging this concession and the further one of the two parishes, in a letter to the Cardinal Prefect—who has been so kind as to announce them to me,—a thing I have not yet done, so as not to inconvenience His Eminence needlessly.

You add that the taxes for sending the Apostolic letters and the Pallium were sixteen Roman Crowns in the Chancellery and you ask whether you must pay this sum for me or leave it to the charge of the Sacred Congregation. Be good enough, Sir, to settle it without delay. It is a very just—a very moderate expense. I shall repay you, with the rest that I shall owe you to the end of this year, either by sending it to you directly, or paying it for you to our venerable friend Msgr. Troy—whichever you wish. All this is a slight matter and soon finished. But the same cannot be said, Monsignor Argenti, of that which remains for us to treat here. With your letter of the 15th of last month, I also received one of the same date from His Eminence the Cardinal Prefect, and with all the respect due rightly to his dignity, place and person, but not without the greatest astonishment and regret His Eminence began by supposing I was already informed that Rev. Henry Conwell—Parish Priest of Dungannon, in this diocese—had been nominated Bishop of Philadelphia by the Sovereign Pontiff. I had, in truth, heard talk of this, some time ago, but without attaching to it the least credit—persuaded that the thing was almost as impossible as to believe that he had been made Emperor of China. Nevertheless, in the course of last week, Msgr. Troy assured me, with the greatest surprise and sorrow, that it was a certain fact, and that Conwell had made it public. Those of my confrères whom I have seen lately, and many of the principal clergy—justly indignant at so dangerous and revolting an example—have begged me as Archbishop of Conwell, to represent the truth in all its nakedness to the Sacred Congregation, which had been so infamously deceived by intrigues and insidious manoeuvres and which would be incapable of choosing for the Episcopate a subject so ill-fitted, if it had the least suspicion that during the long period of years when he was Parish Priest, his ordinary custom was to travel—to rush here and there through France, England, Scotland and Ireland, outside his parish, in which he did not reside, as he was obliged to, to care for the souls entrusted to his charge; and all this without having obtained—not even asked the permission of his ecclesiastical Superiors—at least to avoid the shocking scandal.

Although I knew that these complaints and others were well founded, I had no wish to address them directly to the Sacred Congregation; on the contrary I would be content to recommend M. Conwell, as I had done in the case of Dr. McCann, because I saw that he was worthy of it—but yet I ask you to present this letter when you find it is convenient, and to confine yourself to it.

The said letter of His Eminence remarked, besides, that Conwell had asked and obtained from the Holy See permission to retain the sums which he had received for the future archbishop, during the late vacancy of the See, maintaining that they came from matrimonial charges and as he himself said, he had applied them to the Church and other pious uses; but that, before he had been instructed by the said Papal concession, he had been obliged to pay me about £100 sterling for the reason indicated and which would reduce him to misery if I did not make him some compensation.

It is astonishing how an aged priest, of 74 years, could have the audacity to utter so many falsehoods to the Holy See. It is utterly false that Conwell paid me about £100, or that the little sum he gave me—less than half of that which he received—came from marriage fees, as he invidiously said. They came, principally at least, from the annual contributions—called *Cathedraticum* or *proxies*—of the pastors of the fourteen neighbouring parishes. That

he has given the said money to the Church and other pious works, is false and even ridiculous. A vagabond or non-resident Pastor, never does anything so miraculous, although bound more than anybody to restitution. To cut short these scandalous lies, let him furnish proof of having made these pious largesses, and I promise not only to repay them, but also to give him during my life the income of this Archdiocese. However it is enough for me that the Sacred Congregation has recommended to me M. Conwell, he shall never more have occasion to complain of me, although I am poorer than he.

I have the honor to be, Monsignor,

P. CURTIS.

Drogheda, 14 Feb., 1820.

Keep God in American History, is the rather remarkable title of a little work by H. F. Atwood (Chicago, 1920). "The proudest heritage of this country," he writes, "is that all through its history there has run, like a golden thread, a deeply religious strain." The evidence brought together in support of this thesis begins with the Mayflower Compact and traces its way through the Declaration of Independence, Benjamin Franklin, Washington, Hamilton, Marshall, and Daniel Webster, and ends with a tribute to that "great patriot, Archbishop Ireland." The lesson taught us is not beside the mark: we must have faith that America has neither abandoned God nor been abandoned by God. The same Divine Providence that watched over the founders of this Republic, that guided them in the framing of our Constitution, is still with us to guide and strengthen us (pp. 24-25).

In the *Report of the General Committee on Catholic Affairs and Interests*, presented to the Catholic Hierarchy of America, assembled at the Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C., on September 24-25, 1919, it was suggested that five Departments be created: Education, Catholic Press and Literature, Social Service, Catholic Societies and Lay Activities, and Missions. The Department of Missions, Home and Foreign, was to be created, as the Committee stated, because "the time has come when the Church of America has a special duty to become much more of a missionary Church, at home and abroad" (p. 27). Among the articles offered as a basis for this Department was the following: "We believe that the full direction of all Catholic foreign missionary activities in the world should be in the hands of the Holy See, through the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda; with an International Advisory Board on distribution, study and reports, to Rome" (p. 31). The Committee proposed that all foreign mission funds gathered in the United States should be directed and controlled by a Board appointed for that purpose. This proposal was given a voice in the Pastoral Letter dated September 26, 1919 (pp. 16-17), and the Hierarchy set forth its readiness to begin active work in foreign fields. It was to be expected that this proposal would arouse misgivings in certain quarters, particularly among those who have been directing the work of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, which has its General Council at Lyons, France. This Society—a distinct organization from the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda Fide (created in 1622)—was begun at Lyons in 1822. In 1815, Bishop

Du Bourg, of New Orleans, was in France collecting alms for his vast diocese, and seven years later, a Society for the purpose of aiding all poor missions was begun. The plan was approved by Pius VII in 1823, and in 1840, Gregory XVI placed the new organization among the Universal Catholic institutions. The American Church was in large measure aided by the Lyons Society, and at the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore (1884), Cardinal Gibbons stated to the Directors of the Society: "If the grain of mustard seed planted in the virgin soil of America has struck deep roots and grown into a gigantic tree, with branches stretching from the shores of the Atlantic Ocean to the coasts of the Pacific, it is mainly due to the assistance rendered by your admirable Society that we are indebted for this blessing." Monsignor Freri, of New York City, published in 1902, a history of the work accomplished up to that date in his brochure: *The Society for the Propagation of the Faith and the Catholic Missions* (Balto., 1902). A history of the Society will also be found in the *United States Catholic Miscellany* for 1839, and Bishop England has described its work in his *History of the Propagation of the Faith in the United States* (Works, Messmer Edition, vol. iv, pp. 256-297, Cleveland, 1908). The *Annales de la Propagation de la Foi*, published each year since 1822, are among the most valuable source materials we possess for the history of the Church in this country being in the same category with the *Berichte* of the Leopoldine Association of Vienna. Very few complete sets of these two publications exist in the United States. An almost complete set is in the library of the Sulpician Seminary, at the Catholic University of America. The English *Annals of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith* were first published in Dublin in 1840. Later an English edition was begun in Baltimore. The last available statistics (1910) show that the Society had expended, from 1822 to 1910, almost eighty million dollars.

A special number of the *Woodstock Letters* in commemoration of the Golden Jubilee of the College at Woodstock (1866-1919) has recently been published. It is probably the first number of this periodical allowed to reach the public.

The Editor of *The Catholic Mind* has placed all students of history under obligation by reprinting (Vol. xviii, No. 8, April 22, 1920), Professor Dwight's article: *The French Clergy's Gift to America*. The burden assumed by the clergy in meeting the enormous debt incurred by France at the time of the American Revolution amounted to six million dollars.

A new periodical *The Inter-University Magazine: A Journal for Catholic Students*, has just appeared. The editor is R. H. Rastall, M.A., Christ's College, Cambridge, England. Subscriptions may be sent to Miss T. Taylor, 41 Windle Street, St. Helen's, Lancs. (Three shillings, sixpence). The editors have started out bravely to make known to the Catholic students of some twenty universities in England, Scotland, and Wales, everything of interest in the higher intellectual world. There is to be no haggling about Anglicanism, History of Dogma, or Philosophy, no sham patriotism, no purely local notes, such as those which tell us that Miss A. B. rendered the *O Salutaris* with poignant

charm, but up-to-date, practical, alive questions, like Acton, Mazzini, Private Property, Peter Finlay, S.J., and Dr. John Ryan, the American. There you are. Plenty of thin ice for the poor editors to skate on. "However," as we are blithely told, "provided we don't fall in or down, it might be better than to stand shivering on the bank; and it's far better than sitting dyspeptically in our studies." This *Magazine* will be well worth watching—having—the most sporting Catholic venture of modern times. *Prosit!* A shower of shillings!

During the past academic year the American Church History Seminar, under Dr. Guilday's direction, has been devoting itself to special studies in view of presenting the same within the next few years as finished dissertations for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The following students have qualified for advanced work:

REV. PATRICK WILLIAM BROWNE, Newfoundland, a former Professor of History at the University of Ottawa, and an alumnus of the Propaganda, Rome, and of Columbia University, New York City, is preparing the publication of *DILHET L'Etat de l'Eglise*. This valuable source he has transcribed from the Baltimore copy and he will add a translation of the same, together with an introduction and commentary.

REV. JOHN HUGH O'DONNELL, of the Congregation of the Holy Cross, Litt. B. (Notre Dame University), has already well advanced his *Historiography of Hispanic America* (1492-1821).

REV. KERNDT MICHAEL HEALEY, of the same Congregation, Litt. B. (Notre Dame University), has undertaken the topic: *Conciliar Legislation in the United States* (1791-1884).

REV. JOHN FRANCIS LEARY, of the Archdiocese of Baltimore, is specializing on the subject: *Catholics in the American Revolution* (1775-1783).

REV. JOHN CLEMENT RAGER, of the Diocese of Indianapolis, has begun the translation of the *Leopoldine Association Reports*. Through the kindness of Rev. Dr. Resek, this valuable series of letters from American prelates (1829-1860), has been entrusted to the Seminar for this purpose.

REV. EDWARD JOHN HICKEY, of the Diocese of Detroit, has gathered considerable material for his doctoral dissertation: *English Catholic Refugee Movements to America* (1559-1634).

These volumes, when published, will form the first fruits of the American Church History Seminar.

Students in American history will rejoice in the news that Dilhet's *L'Etat de l'Eglise catholique ou du Diocese des Etats-Unis de l'Amerique Septentrionale* is being prepared for publication. The manuscript is the possession of the Sulpician Fathers, of Baltimore. It is bound in red leather, octavo in size, and contains one hundred and twenty-eight pages of closely written material. The writing is fair, but here and there the ink has begun to fade and the paper to mold. The author of this earliest American Church History (cf. BERTRAND, *Bibliothèque Sulpicienne ou Histoire Littéraire de la Compagnie de Saint-Sulpice*, vol. ii, pp. 35-37, Paris, 1900), Jean Dilhet, was born at Toulouse on November 18,

1753. He entered the Grand Séminaire of Toulouse in 1774, and after having finished the prescribed course of studies, he was ordained and sent to Bourges, where he remained from 1778 to 1787. The following two years were spent at Avignon as superior of the philosophical department in the Seminary of that city. Towards the end of the year, 1797, he left for the United States, arriving here on January 13, 1798. His first mission was that of Rivière-aux-Raisin, in the Detroit Mission. Mr. J. A. Girardin in his sketch of the *Life and Times of Rev. Gabriel Richard* (*Michigan Pioneer Collections*, vol. I, pp. 481-495), has given us a glimpse of Father Dilhet's arduous labours in Michigan. His stay was not a long one, and in 1805, he was recalled to France. On reaching Baltimore, he cooperated with Father Nagot in founding the Petit Séminaire at Pigeon Hill, which later was transferred to Emmitsburg and is at present the renowned Mount St. Mary's College. Father Dilhet arrived at Paris in 1807, and was then sent to Limoges. In 1810, he was given the task of reestablishing the Seminary at Puy, and it was there he died on October 31, 1811. He was well versed in the Indian tongues of the territory wherein he labored as a missionary, and gained considerable fame while in America for his eloquence. His *State of the Catholic Church, or of the Diocese of the United States of North America* is divided into two parts: the first contains the principal historical facts and personages of the Catholic Church in the United States; and the second is a geographical description of the country as he knew it both by observation and by study. It is not divided into chapters, but the captions found on almost every page assist the reader in following the story as Dilhet has written it. It begins with a chapter on the origin of the English colonies in North America and on the state of the Catholic missions there before American Independence. A second chapter tells the story of the establishment of the Diocese of Baltimore and the consecration of Bishop Carroll. A third chapter describes the foundation of St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore. Then follow in order: the Diocesan Synod of Baltimore (1791); the State of the Church in Maryland, the City of Baltimore, the City of Washington, Bladensburg, Whitmarsh, St. Mary's County, Charles County, Prince George County, Montgomery County, Frederick County, Washington County. Then follows a Catalogue of the Catholic Priests in the United States. The state of the Church in Pennsylvania is well described, and other chapters are given on the Church in New York, Massachusetts, Maine, Virginia, South Carolina, and Georgia. A chapter on Bardstown follows, and it is in this particular part of his "History" that we learn the details of his own labours in the Mission of Michigan. The little book is apparently complete. It closes with the following paragraph:

Nous terminerons cet ouvrage que nous ne pouvons appeller une histoire ni un essai historique de la Religion Catholique des États Unis, mais qui donnera un état de la Religion Catholique dans les États-Unis propre à nous faire bénir la providence de Dieu dans les graces sans nombre qu'Il a versé dans ce pays depuis un certain nombre d'années et à faire naître de plus grandes espérances pour un prochain avenir pour la propagation de la vraie foi et à l'extension de la véritable église qui est le Royaume de J. C. sur la terre.

Father Dilhet's *État d'Eglise* is not a source of the highest historical importance, but it has all the unique value of a contemporary document.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

GUIDE TO THE BIOGRAPHICAL SOURCES OF THE AMERICAN HIERARCHY¹

(G-H-I-J-K)

GALBERRY, Bishop Thomas, O.S.A. (1833(?)-1878); Bp. of Hartford (1876-1878).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 45; CHR, Vol. ii, pp. 297-298; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, pp. 256-257; CLARKE, *op. cit.*, Vol. iii, pp. 128-140; ROONEY, *Early Times in the Diocese of Hartford*, in CHR, Vol. i, pp. 148-163; CUB, Vol. vii, p. 233 *seq.* (History of Hartford Diocese); O'DONNELL, *History of Diocese of Hartford*. Boston, 1900; see bibliography of Hartford Diocese in CHR, Vol. iv, p. 391.

GALLAGHER, Bishop Nicholas Aloysius (1846-1918); Administrator of Galveston (1882-1892); Bp. of Galveston (1892-1918).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 45; CHR, Vol. i, p. 135; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, p. 239.

GARCADIAGO, Y MORENO, Bishop Francis, O.F.M. (1785-1846); Bp. of the Two Californias (1840-1846).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, pp. 46-47 (important data; Reuss claims that the spelling *Garcia Diego* is incorrect); ENGELHARDT, *Missions and Missionaries of California*, Vol. iv, pp. 194 *seq.*; CHR, Vol. i, pp. 292, 294; CLARKE, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 157-166; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, 169; see important bibliography of San Francisco Diocese in CHR, Vol. iv, pp. 389-390; cf *Index* to ENGELHARDT, *Missions, etc.*, pp. 31-32.

GARTLAND, Bishop Francis Xavier (1805-1854); Bp. of Savannah (1850-1854).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, pp. 47-48; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, p. 362; CLARKE, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 408-414; CHR, Vol. i, p. 187 (Bishop Gartland to Leopoldine Association, Paris, Sept. 9, 1851), p. 377; ACHS *Researches*, Vol. iv, p. 138, Vol. vii, pp. 33, 103, Vol. xii, p. 36 (letters of 1852), Vol. xiii, p. 80, Vol. xxi, p. 11 (diary of), Vol. xxii, pp. 78, 87; McCANN, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, *passim*; cf. O'CONNELL, *Catholicity in the Carolinas and Georgia*.

GARRIGAN, Bishop Philip Joseph (1840-1919); Bp. of Sioux City (1902-1919).

CUB, Vol. ii, pp. 214, 575, 585, Vol. x, p. 382, Vol. viii, pp. 385-386 (consecration of), Vol. xxvi, p. 17 (Necrology); HERBERMANN, *Sulpicians, etc.*, p. 214; cf. *The Church in Sioux City*, and *The Church in the Diocese of Sioux City*—two brochures published in 1918 under Bishop Garrigan's direction.

GILMOUR, Bishop Richard (1824-1891); Bp. of Cleveland (1872-1891).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 48; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, pp. 206-208; HOUCK, *Church in Northern Ohio, etc.*, pp. 67-75. New York, 1887; ACHS *Researches*, Vol. xxii, p. 180, Vol. xxiv, p. 66, Vol. xxvi, p. 250; SWEENEY, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 446, 457, 462; Vol. ii, pp. 98, 180, 190, 202, 213; CHR, Vol. ii, p. 228,

¹Cf. CHR., Vol. v, pp. 120-128 (A-B), Vol. v, pp. 290-296 (C), Vol. vi, pp. 128-132 (D-E-F). ABBREVIATIONS: ACHS (American Catholic Historical Society); ACQR (American Catholic Quarterly Review); AER (American Ecclesiastical Review); AHR (American Historical Review); CE (Catholic Encyclopedia); CHR (Catholic Historical Review); CUB (Catholic University Bulletin); CW (Catholic World); ICHR (Illinois Catholic Historical Review); USCHS (United States Catholic Historical Society).

Vol. iv, p. 272 (Bibliography of Cleveland Diocese); see also two-volume edition of HOUCK, Vol. i, pp. 105-163 (well documented).

GLORIEUX, Bishop Alphonse Joseph (1844-1917); Vicar-Apostolic of Idaho (1895-1898); Bp. of Boise City (1893-1917).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 49; CHR, Vol. i, p. 384; ACHS *Researches*, Vol. xxiii; p. 165; VANDERHEYDEN, *The American College of Lourain*, Louvain, 1909, VAN DER DONCKT, *The Founders of the Church in Idaho*, in AER, Vol. xxxii.

GRAESSEL (or Graessl), Bishop-elect Lawrence (1753-1793); first Coadjutor-elect in the United States, Baltimore (1793).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 50; H. F. HERBERMANN, *Lawrence Graessel*, in the USCHS *Historical Records, etc.*, Vol. viii, pp. 209-222; C. G. HERBERMANN, *Correspondence of Graessel*, in the *United States Catholic Historical Magazine*, Vol. i, pp. 68-70; KIRLIN, *Catholicity in Philadelphia*, pp. 146-148. Cf. CHR, Vol. iv, p. 392 (Bibliography of Philadelphia Diocese).

GRACE, Archbishop Thomas, O.P. (1814-1879); Bp. of St. Paul (1857-1884); resigned, 1884.

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 50; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, p. 378; CHR, Vol. iii, p. 156; ACHS *Researches*, Vol. viii, p. 96, Vol. xii, p. 46; CHR, Vol. iv, p. 544 (Bibliography of St. Paul Diocese); SCHAEFER, *History of the Diocese of St. Paul*, in *Acta et Dicta*, Vol. iv, pp. 32-75.

GROSS, Archbishop William, C.S.S.R. (1837-1898); Bp. of Savannah (1873-1885); Archbp. of Oregon City (1885-1898).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 51; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, pp. 153-154; O'HARA, *The Church in Oregon*, pp. 156-165; O'HARA, *Catholic Pioneers of the Oregon Country*, in CHR, Vol. iii, pp. 187-201; HERBERMANN, *Sulpicians, etc.*, p. 263; cf. O'CONNELL, *op. cit.*

HEALY, Bishop James Augustine (1830-1900); Bp. of Portland, Me. (1875-1900).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 52; CHR, Vol. ii, p. 299; *Maine Catholic Historical Magazine, passim*, since 1913; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, pp. 345-346.

HEISS, Archbishop Michael (1818-1890); Bp. of La Crosse (1868-1880); Coadjutor-Archbishop of Milwaukee (1880-1881); Archbp. of Milwaukee (1881-1890).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 52; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, pp. 114-117; CHR, Vol. iii, pp. 27, 29.

HENDRICK, Bishop Thomas (?-1909); Bp. of Cebu, P. I. (1903-1909).

CHR, Vol. iv, p. 81.

HENDRICKEN, Bishop Thomas Francis (1827-1886); Bp. of Providence (1872-1886).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 52; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, pp. 347-384; CLARKE, *op. cit.*, Vol. iii, pp. 324-338; CHR, Vol. ii, p. 350; cf. Bibliography of Boston Province in CHR, Vol. iv, pp. 391-392; *History of the Catholic Church in the New England States*. Boston, 1889.

HENNESSY, Archbishop John (1825-1900); Bp. of Dubuque (1866-1893); Archbp. of Dubuque (1893-1900).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 53; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, pp. 230-231; KEMPKER, *History of Catholic Church in Iowa*. Iowa City, 1887; *Souvenir Volume of the Silver Jubilee of Archbishop Hennessy*.

HENNI, Archbishop John Martin (1805-1881); Bp. of Milwaukee (1844-1875); Archbp. of Milwaukee (1875-1881).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 53; CHR, Vol. iii, p. 27; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, pp. 111-113; CLARKE, *op. cit.*, Vol. iii, pp. 324-338.

HESLIN, Bishop Thomas (1847-1911); Bp. of Natchez (1889-1911).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 54; CHR, Vol. i, p. 132.

HOGAN, Bishop John Joseph (1829-1913); Bp. of St. Joseph (1863-1880-1893); Bp. of Kansas City (1880-1893-1913).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, pp. 54-55; CHR, Vol. ii, pp. 387-388; *Catholic Church Annals of Kansas City*, article by KEUENHOR, in CHR, Vol. iii, pp. 326-335; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, p. 263; HOGAN, *On the Mission in Missouri*. Kansas City, 1892; cf. GARRAGHAN, *Catholic Beginnings in Kansas City, Mo.* Chicago, 1920.

HORSTMANN, Bishop Ignatius Frederick (1840-1908); Bp. of Cleveland (1892-1908).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 35; CHR, Vol. ii, p. 289; CUB, Vol. ii, p. 106; cf. BRANN, *History of the American College, Rome, 1898*; HOUCK, *The Catholic Church in Northern Ohio and in the Diocese of Cleveland*, Vol. i, pp. 164-192, Vol. ii, pp. 40-45.

HUGHES, Archbishop John (1797-1864); Coadjutor-Bp. of New York (1838-1842); Bp. of New York (1842-1850); Archbp. of New York (1850-1864).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 55; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, pp. 136-141; CLARKE, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 73-125; CHR, Vol. ii, p. 140 (biographical data); *ibid.*, Vol. iii, pp. 336-339 (documents relative to his mission to France); CW, Vol. iii, pp. 140 *et seq.* (review of Hassard's *Life*); ACHS *Researches*, Vols. vi, vii, viii, xii, xiv, xvii, Vol. xix, p. 171 (Necrology), Vol. xxii, p. 93 (Brooks Controversy), Vols. xxiii, xxviii—these volumes best consulted in *Index of Researches*; SWEENEY, *op. cit.*, Vols. i and ii *passim*, especially Vol. i, pp. 89, 99, 126, 136, 140-146; HERBERMANN, *Sulpicians, etc.*, pp. 191, 228, 306; BAYLEY, *op. cit.*, pp. 133-147; CLARKE, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 73-125; HASSARD, *Life of Archbishop Hughes*. New York, 1866; BRANN, *John Hughes*. New York, 1892; KEHOE, *Works of Archbishop Hughes*, 2 vols. New York, 1864; USCHS *Hist. Records, etc.*, Vol. i, p. 171, Vol. ii, p. 227, Vol. iii, p. 282; MAURY, *Statesmen in America in 1846*. London, 1847; BAKER, *Works of William H. Seward*, Vol. iii, p. 482 *et seq.* New York, 1853; the archival material for the episcopate of Hughes is well preserved in the Dunwoodie (New York) archives.

IRELAND, Archbishop John (1838-1918); Coadjutor-Bp. of St. Paul (1875-1884); Bp. of St. Paul (1884-1888); Archbp. of St. Paul (1888-1918).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 56; CHR, Vol. iii, p. 156; CUB, Vol. iii, p. 89, Vol. xxiv, p. 127 (Necrology); AER, Vol. xxiv, pp. 418 *et seq.* (On the Temporal Power); SWEENEY, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, p. 328; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, p. 379; cf. files of the *Catholic Bulletin* (St. Paul), for Sept.-Oct., 1918.

JANSEN, Bishop John (1835-1913); Bp. of Belleville (1888-1913);

REUSS, *op. cit.*, pp. 56-57; CHR, Vol. iii, p. 154.

JANSENS, Archbishop Francis (1843-1897); Bp. of Natchez (1881-1888); Archbp. of New Orleans (1888-1897).

- REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 56; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, pp. 313-317; CHR, Vol. ii, pp. 130, 132; AEH, Vol. vi, p. 450, Vol. xvii, p. 70 (Necrology); ACHS *Researches*, Vol. v, p. 100.
- JUNCKER, Bishop Henry Damian (1809-1868); Bp. of Alton (1857-1868).
 REUSS, *op. cit.*, pp. 57-58; CHR, Vol. iii, p. 153; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, p. 184; CLARKE, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 529-535.
- JUNGER, Bishop Aedigius (1833-1895); Bp. of (Nesqually) Seattle (1879-1895).
 REUSS, *op. cit.*, pp. 58-59 (important data); CHR, Vol. i, 383; see bibliography of Seattle Diocese in CHR, Vol. iv, p. 266; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, pp. 322-323.
- KAIN, Archbishop John Joseph (1841-1903); Bp. of Wheeling (1875-1893); Coadjutor-Archbp. of St. Louis (1893-1895); Archbp. of St. Louis (1895-1903).
 REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 59; CHR, Vol. i, pp. 376, 387; CUB, Vol. ii, p. 427; SWEENY, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, p. 369; HERBERMANN, *Sulpicians, etc.*, pp. 263, 308; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, p. 391.
- KATZER, Archbishop Frederic Xavier (1844-1903); Bp. of Green Bay (1866-1891); Archbp. of Milwaukee (1891-1903).
 REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 59; CHR, Vol. iii, pp. 27, 28; CUB, Vol. ix, p. 574; AER, Vol. vi, pp. 241 *et seq.* (On Forbidden Societies); ACHS *Researches*, Vol. xii, p. 38, Vol. xx, p. 128; cf. STECKEL, *The Catholic Church in Wisconsin*, in the ACHS *Records*, Vol. vii, pp. 225-233.
- KEANE, Archbishop John Joseph (1839-1918); Bp. of Richmond (1878-1888); Rector of The Catholic University of America (1888-1896); titular Archbp. of Damascus (1897-1900); Archbp. of Dubuque (1900-1911); resigned, 1911.
 REUSS, *op. cit.*, pp. 59-60; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, pp. 353-356; CHR, Vol. i, p. 375, Vol. iii, p. 160; CUB, Vol. xxvi, p. 38 (list of his writings on the Cath. Univ. of Amer.); HERBERMANN, *Sulpicians, etc.*, pp. 206, 310, 311; CUB, Vol. ii, pp. 97, 103, 214, 305, 367-368, 428, 444, 592; Vol. v, p. 395; Vol. ix, pp. 277, 370; Vol. xii, p. 303; AER, Vol. i, p. 241; Vol. xvi, p. 78 (his resignation of Rectorship); ACHS *Researches*, Vol. ix, p. 191; Vol. xii, p. 97; vol. xxviii, p. 148; SWEENY, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 262.
- KELLY, Bishop Patrick (1779-1820); Bp. of Richmond (1821-1822); Bp. of Waterford and Lismore, Ireland (1822-1829).
 REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 60 (important data); CLARKE, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 268-270; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, p. 349; CHR, Vol. i, p. 375; *Catholicity in Virginia* (1850-1872), article by MAGRI, in CHR, Vol. ii, pp. 415-426; ACHS *Researches*, Vol. xix, p. 107, Vol. xx, p. 39, Vol. xxiii, p. 27, Vol. xxvii, p. 347; HERBERMANN, *Sulpicians, etc.*, p. 184; MAGRI, *The Catholic Church in Richmond*, pp. 44-46; cf. bibliography of Richmond Diocese in CHR, Vol. iv, p. 266.
- KENNY, Bishop William John (1853-1913); Bp. of St. Augustine (1903-1913).
 CHR, Vol. i, p. 378.
- KENRICK, Archbishop Francis Patrick (1796-1863); Coadjutor-Bp. of Philadelphia (1830-1843); Bp. of Philadelphia (1843-1851); Archbp. of Baltimore (1851-1863).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 61; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, pp. 74-76; CLARKE, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 473-517; see *Index to ACHS Researches*, pp. 164-165; CHR, Vol. i, p. 374, Vol. ii, p. 23; O'CONNOR, *Archbishop Kenrick and His Work*, Philadelphia, 1867; SWEENEY, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, *passim*, esp. pp. 240-248, 274-279; HERBERMANN, *Sulpicians, etc.*, pp. 213, 306-307; O'SHEA, *The Two Kenricks*, Philadelphia, 1904; cf. *Diary and Visitation Record of Bishop Kenrick*, Philadelphia, 1916.

KENRICK, Archbishop Peter Richard (1806-1896); Coadjutor Bp. of St. Louis (1841-1843); Bp. of St. Louis (1843-1847); Archbp. of St. Louis (1847-1895); resigned, 1895.

REUSS, *op. cit.*, pp. 61-62; CHR, Vol. i, p. 387; AER, Vol. xvi, p. 73 (Necrology); ACQR, Vol. xii, p. 425 (biography by Archbishop Ryan); SWEENEY, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, p. 303; O'SHEA, *The Two Kenricks*, Philadelphia, 1904.

KRAUTBAUER, Bishop Francis Xavier (1824-1885); Bp. of Green Bay (1875-1885).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 62; CHR, Vol. iii, p. 28; ACHS *Researches*, Vol. iv, pp. 152, 155; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, pp. 249-250; CLARKE, *op. cit.*, Vol. iii, pp. 346-356.

PETER GUILDAY.

(To be continued.)

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here does not preclude extended notices in later issues of the REVIEW.)

- ASLAN, KEVORK. Translated from the French by Pierre Crabites. *Armenia and the Armenians*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1920. Pp. 138.
- BOGART, ERNEST LUDLOW, and MATHEWS, JOHN MABRY. *The Modern Commonwealth, 1893-1918. The Centennial History of Illinois*, Vol. v. Springfield: Centennial Commission, 1920. Pp. 544.
- BRUCKER, PERE JOSEPH. *La Compagnie de Jésus*. Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne, 1919. Pp. 839.
- BURKE, THOMAS F., C.S.P. *Reconstruction Virtues*. New York: The Paulist Press, 1920. Pp. 66.
- CAPEK, THOMAS. *The Czechs (Bohemians) in America*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Company, 1920. Pp. 284.
- Carnegie Institution of Washington. Annual Report of the Department of Historical Research Extract from Year-Book 18, for the year 1919. Pp. 175 to 184.
- CASACCA, VERY REV. NAZARENO, O.S.A., D.D. *The Pope and Italy*. Translated from the original by Rev. J. A. Hickey, O.S.A., D.D., with a Preface by Most Rev. D. J. Dougherty, D.D., Archbishop of Philadelphia. Philadelphia: John Joseph McVey, 1920. Pp. 62.
- CLEMENTS, WILLIAM L. *Americana*. Bay City, Mich., 1920.
- DEHON, R. P. L. *La Vie Intérieure, Ses Principes (Ses Voies Diverses) et Sa Pratique*. Paris: Pierre Tequi, 1919. Pp. 270.
- DEMEURAN, J. LOUIS. *Le Droit Canon des Laiques d'après le Nouveau Code*. Paris: P. Tequi, 1919. Pp. 251.
- DOGGETT, CARITA. *Dr. Andrew Turnbull and the New Smyrna Colony of Florida*. Florida: The Drew Press, 1919. Pp. 212.
- FOERSTER, ROBERT F., Ph.D. *The Italian Emigration of Our Times*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920.
- GARRAGHAN, REV. GILBERT J., S.J. *Catholic Beginnings in Kansas City, Missouri*. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1920. Pp. 137.
- GASQUET, CARDINAL. *History of the Venerable English College, Rome*. New York: Longmans, Green & Company, 1920. Pp. 291.
- GIBIER, MSGR. EVÊQUE DE VERSAILLES. *Le Relèvement National*. Paris: Pierre Tequi, 1919. Pp. 378.
- KANE, REV. ROBERT, S.J. *Worth*. New York: Longmans, Green & Company, 1920. Pp. 226.
- KELLOGG, CHARLOTTE. *Mercier, the Fighting Cardinal of Belgium*. Foreword by Brand Whitlock. New York: D. Appleton & Company, 1920. Pp. 249.
- KREBS, ARSENE. *Dieu me suffit, spécialement dédié aux mois du coeur eucharistique de Jésus*. Paris: Pierre Tequi, 1920. Pp. 241.
- LEMOINE, L'ABBE. *Je crois en Jésus-Christ*. Paris: Pierre Tequi, 1920. Pp. 331.
- MILLOT, J. *Mariage—Célibat: Vie Religieuse*. Paris: Pierre Tequi, 1919. Pp. 285.
- O'HARA, JOHN P. *A History of the United States*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1919. Pp. 461.

- ROBINSON, REV. CUTHBERT. *Nicolo Ormaneto, a Papal Envoy in the Sixteenth Century*. London: The Catholic Repository, 1920. Pp. 98.
- ROUZIC, LOUIS. *Le Renouveau Catholique*. Paris: Pierre Tequi, 1919. Pp. 295.
- SWANTON, JOHN R. *A Structural and Lexical Comparison of the Tunica, Chitimacha and Atakepa Languages*. Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 68. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1919. Pp. 56.
- THORNDIKE, LYNN, Ph.D. *History of Medieval Europe*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Company, 1920. Pp. 682.
- TOUT, T. F., M.A., F.B.A. *Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England*. Vols. i and ii. New York: Longmans, Green & Company, 1920. Pp., Vol. i, 317; ii, 364.
- VAN DER ESSEN, LEON, Ph.D., LL.D. *A Short History of Belgium*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1920. Pp. 198.
- WEST, WILLIS MASON. *The Story of Modern Progress*. New York: Allyn & Bacon. Pp. 701+32.
-

Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio

Academy for Girls

Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio, under the direction of the Sisters of Charity, is situated eight miles northwest of Cincinnati on a noble eminence overlooking the Ohio river.

Nature seems to have designed and purposed this beautiful hill-top as the site for an institution for young women. Situated as it is on an elevation six hundred feet high, commanding a view of the Ohio river and the far-famed Kentucky hills, it would be difficult to find a more ideal location for a seat of learning.

GRAMMAR DEPARTMENT
ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT
COLLEGIATE DEPARTMENT

*Affiliated with The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.*

All letters pertaining to the Academy should be addressed to
THE DIRECTRESS

Mt. St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio

HAMILTON COUNTY

OHIO